



20%^{off} on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



BET EMET MINISTRIES

HEBREW FOR "HOUSE OF TRUTH"

PASTOR CRAIG M. LYONS Ms.D., D.D., M.DIV.



AN UNBIASED LOOK INTO THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...AND THE ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ITS CANONIZATION

Everybody wants to go to Heaven. That is without question. If you grew up as a Christian in the Western Hemisphere you have been taught the "path to Heaven" primarily from one source and one source only; namely the New Testament part of the Bible. You most likely grew up listening to doctrine and dogmas as taken from the New Testament being espoused from pulpit to pulpit Sunday after Sunday as your were taught to trust these "New Testament Scriptures" for your path to being "saved" eternally. Many of you repeated the "sinners prayer" and depending upon your various denomination, or lack there of, faithfully followed your spiritual leaders as they led you down the path of Eternal Life as taught from the New Testament. After all, you were most likely taught you have a "new" Covenant no less and the New Testament was living proof to such a Covenant because it came directly from God as holy men of old were moved by the Holy Spirit to convey God's revelation. After all, you were taught that the Apostles and followers of Jesus wrote it. You were taught you had eye-witness accounts written by those who knew Jesus best in the New Testament. The infallibility and inerrancy of the New Testament was explicitly, if not implicitly implied from sermon to sermon.

HAVE YOU EVER STUDIED FOR YOURSELF THE ORIGIN OF THE NEW TESTAMENT?

Most of us take it for granted to have a New Testament and do not bother to know how we got it. We assume

that Jesus believed everything in it since we are taught growing up as a Christian that it is God's Word. Few ever consider the possibility that the documents comprising this "New Testament" contradict the Old Testament, Moses, and the Prophets. This inability to recognize the New Testament's contradictions of the Old Testament comes from the fact that we grew up as "New Testament Christians" instead of "Old Testament Christians" first. Had we learned the Jewish Scriptures first, then when reading the New Testament we could more readily spot the "forgeries" and "conflicts" within this New Testament. Therefore one approaches the New Testament with the idea of its "inspiration" already in place long before any serious study is done to verify if such documents are in really "God-breathed". The question concerning the origin of the New Testament or why the New Testament has only twenty seven books, not more and not less, hardly comes to our mind. We never stop to think that Jesus never read a word of it or might not have agreed with all that is written within it, let alone his followers in the first century. Again, we are conditioned to believe that since it has the names of the Apostles attached to the documents that they were the sanctioned authors and by default believe that this was accepted truth way back in the first century by the early church. While all of us are unlikely to think that the New Testament just simply dropped from the sky, we may not realize the long process which took place before those twenty seven books were finally selected. Few Christians have ever given any or little thought as to how these various documents were collected and put into this collection called the New Testament. Looking back at the long process (around three hundred years) which took place to define what belongs to our New Testament, one today usually accepts the New Testament without question. The vast majority of believers never stop to ask: what is the criteria of canonicity? Several criteria have been proposed, among them: apostolic authority (was it written by one of the apostles?), Antiquity (was it written in the first century?), orthodoxy (does it teach apostolic faith?), inspiration (did the writer claim inspiration?). Yet none of the above criteria can judge absolutely the canonicity of particular book. Unless the original manuscript of the book can be found (and be verified) no one can absolutely prove that it was written by those whose names it carries. The sad news is that no original manuscripts actually exist so such knowledge is not readily attained.

Answer for yourself: How do we know that the 27 books we read are genuine, reliable, and really should be included? Are they "books" the early Jewish Church read and venerated that the Gentile Catholic Church excluded? Are some of the books in the current New Testament not considered "inspired" by the earliest church and its surviving testimony? Why are they in there then and what were the reasons for there inclusion?

Again, these are questions many of us who are committed Evangelicals fear to ask and when we search out the subject we often stay as close as possible to our favorite Bible teachers. However there are some surprises about the canon of the New Testament and the authority of the Scriptures that we rarely face. And this reticence prevents us from being completely faithful to the Bible and to what the historical Jesus really believed and taught.

One seems to approach the New Testament as if it is worthy of trust and yet has never checked out the origin of the document itself or the history behind it. Church tradition and its acceptance and promotion of this New Testament is in reality what people trust for their salvation in the final regard and not the facts concerning these documents or the facts concerning their compilation. I used to be like the vast majority of millions of Christians out there who approached the New Testament without question one in these regards. For after all, if it was good enough for mom and dad it was good enough for me. Even after Seminary that was my view; that is until I continued my studies following graduation from Southwestern Theological Seminary when everything changed once I was able to use the Biblical skills I learned to study beyond the "company line."

Jesus wrote no book and did not give any commandment to write down his teaching as testified by the four Gospels. He did not need to; his teachings were those already contained in the Jewish Scriptures. Jesus saw no need for "another book." The one given by YHWH was sufficient and man could not improve upon it. Neither he nor his apostles (including Paul) gave us the list and approved any of the twenty seven New Testament books. They neither used nor introduced the terms Old and New Testaments. Those unbiblical terms were first used by Tertullian (c 170 C.E.). In fact Jesus and the later apostolic teachings were first transmitted and taught orally. What most Christians fail to realize is that when Paul and others mentioned Scripture what they meant exactly is the Old Testament books which were then present. Jesus never conceived the idea of the need for "further" revelation or the need for another "Bible." The "jots" and "titles" were never to pass away and

salvation was taught and obtained by the doctrines contained in the Old Testament. Mankind was not without a plan for salvation and no "new" revelation was needed.

I can remember the first Bible (New Testament) I bought as an adult. I entered a Zondervan's Christian Book Store and repeated to the clerk on duty: "I want the most accurate translation you have....I want the Bible closest to what Jesus used." Boy was I naive. Since then I have read hundreds of books by authors and scholars as far back as the eighteenth century. I have been blessed to have at my disposal currently in my library many of these valuable volumes that tell a completely different story concerning this "New Testament" than what is pumped out by various Seminaries, Christian Churches, and Christian medias of our land. The truth and the facts concerning the New Testament are not being brought to the attention of the believers today. These incriminating facts remain hidden on dusty library shelves where few every learn to look or read for that matter.

So we come to the big question. What authority should this document have for the believer today? What role should it have in light of its origin, history, and composition.

WHAT EVERY CHRISTIAN NEEDS TO KNOW ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT

To make an honest and personal evaluation of the authority that the New Testament should have for one's religious belief system one needs to equip himself with the facts from the earliest sources and the information available to us today concerning such things like:

- 1. The identity of those who determined the content of the New Testament,
- 2. The reason for a New Testament in the first place,
- 3. The criteria that was used for the selection of what books were to be in the New Testament,
- 4. The criteria as to what made for many books being excluded from the canon of the New Testament which the Jerusalem Church had used and venerated,
- 5. The long conflicting history of books being "in" the canon one minute and "out" the next as chronicled over hundreds of years,
- 6. The time interval for the inclusion and completion of the selection of these books following the Great Commission,
- 7. The disagreements between most all who voiced opinions as to what was "in and out,"
- 8. The existing theologies of those who selected and altered the books in the New Testament....especially in light of the belief that the Holy Spirit led these in the canonization of the New Testament but failed to lead them into other theological truths
- 9. The bloodshed which surrounds these disagreements supposedly led by the Holy Spirit,
- 10. The hundreds of thousands of variant readings among the New Testament fragments; many of which have a definite effect upon doctrine
- 11. The hundreds of misquotations, mistranslations, and verses taken out of context by the New Testament writers when compared with the Jewish Scriptures which Jesus read and used, etc... ..then you would be hard pressed to connect any of this with the movement of the Holy Spirit.

Since the normative Christian is not being armed with such "facts" by the church today, one then is relegated to approaching the documents in question armed with little more than the legends and traditions which he has inherited from his Gentile Church history concerning the New Testament; a tradition which I will soon show you is embellished to staggering proportions and far from the actual truth concerning the matters at hand.

Bet Emet Ministries believes you have a right to know these truths; in fact you need to know because

your Eternal Life ultimately depends on what you believe and how you respond to these beliefs.

Answer for yourself: What will happen upon your death if you have believed in error; believed tradition concerning the New Testament over discernible facts and truths concerning it which not only expose its errors, but could have been made plainly evident to you investing a couple of days reading this web-site or having spent a couple days in a library once you know where to look for this information?

Answer for yourself: Have you ever taken the time to investigate why the Jews and Jewish scholars, Jews like Jesus, don't believe the New Testament? Are there things they know which the Christian Church does not know or won't face because they would rather accept "traditions" instead of reproducible truth?

The bottom line is that the current New Testament "believer" today has little or no idea how he inherited the New Testament or how it was gathered let alone who the real authors of these documents were. I wish I could tell you that it was as simple as opening the front of your New Testament and everything from the names attached to each individual document and the dogmas and doctrines it espoused are true and given by God; let alone believed by Jesus when he walked among us. Yet a little serious personal investigation and a lot of reading concerning the origin of the New Testament will prove such hopes false.

Often we at Bet Emet are not understood when being critical of some, but not all of what the New Testament teaches. The reason we are is that we are armed with the "facts," facts our detractors fail to possess. Many approach our ministry armed with little more than zeal; and zeal is good...if it is harnessed and undergirds truth and not error. We understand such misunderstanding because most of our readers have not had the opportunity to read and study to the level we have over the last 15 years where we discovered much that forced us to make changes in our religious belief system. Simply we found, based upon our studies, that much of the New Testament, especially in doctrinal positions, was a replacement of the actual beliefs of a Rabbi named Yeshua (Jesus) who lived in the first century. This was a planned endeavor without a doubt. Such is the fruit of anti-Semitism regardless if you can see it at this stage of your spiritual development or not. Such is of the same spirit that killed Jesus. A cursory reading of the New Testament does not always provide such an understanding, for most read it as if it is "inspired, infallible, and inerrant" due to the subconscious brainwashing since childhood. Only the diligent student comes to a point in his life where he sees what others seem to miss. Understand that such a false trust and belief in the New Testament by most Christians today is not based upon the reader's individual study, but rather upon the hearsay he has picked up by listening to others express such trust in the New Testament. The sad fact of the matter is that those who say such things have never done their homework to the depth necessary to see the problems inherent in accepting the New Testament as authoritative for one's faith and practice. The New Testament was never meant to be a replacement book for the Jewish Scriptures, but sadly has become that today for the vast majority of non-Jewish believers in God.

THE NEW TESTAMENT CAN NEVER CONTRADICT THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES AND BE TRUE

Doctrine, when found in the New Testament, to be true must conform to the Word of God.....THE OLD TESTAMENT:

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isaiah 8:20)

Answer for yourself: Do you believe the above verse?

If you don't then there is no further need for you to continue to read the rest of the web-site.

Thus, according to Isaiah the prophet, if we find doctrines in the New Testament which contradict the Jewish Scriptures...such doctrines are to be understood as fables and lies. To fail to do so contradicts Isaiah the Prophet as well as Moses.

Answer for yourself: Does such doctrinal deviations and contradictions occur in the New Testament? Yes!

Answer for yourself: Should such doctrinal contradictions of the Eternal Word of God as found in the Jewish Scriptures be the impetus for your serious study into the origin and reliability of the New Testament? It sure should!

Answer for yourself: Is it wise to believe that the Holy Spirit led the early Gentile Church Fathers into all truth, and should we trust their collection of writings called the New Testament when they, in many places, contradict Moses, the Prophets, Jesus, and the Bible they used? Maybe you have noticed this yet but your failure to see it does not negate its existence.

We at Bet Emet Ministries, after examining the evidence for ourselves, can no longer believe the New Testament is the product of the Holy Spirit and we offer no man apologies.

Serious study on your part will prove the fact beyond all question that the Holy Spirit had nothing to do with the collection and canonization of the New Testament!

You will soon see why we say that if you continue to read. There is much to share with you in this web-site as we begin a serious and in-depth study and examination into the history of the New Testament. Let us begin by looking at some important questions whose answers should have a staggering impact upon what you now currently believe about the New Testament.

BEFORE WE BEGIN OUR SERIOUS STUDY...LET US LOOK AT THE FRUIT OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Just look realistically at modern Christianity today (Catholic or Protestant). Just look at the conditions of most Christian communities in the world or America. It should not take you long to notice that something is desperately wrong with the fruit of such religious folly.

The Gallop poll tell us that the United States of America is known as the Christian center of the world. In the United States of America there are more Christians, more churches, more priests & preachers, and more money spent promoting Christianity, than any other place in the world. There is a Christian Church on every corner and literally the Christian message on half of the cable channels if you subscribe. The "Gospel" of the New Testament is broadcast continually and it is hard to find one today which has not heard the Christian message hundreds of times. With such saturation by the Church and its preaching of the New Testament, we like Jesus, should expect to find good fruit when we examine our "olive tree".

Answer for yourself: What do we find? The USA is known not for its righteousness, and Godliness, but rather for its huge consumption of illegal and legal mood altering drugs, our clergy molesting our children with their faces blasted across our televisions to the shame of all things holy, our clergy caught with prostitutes or running off with the ministry's funds, alcoholism wide spread let alone promoted on Sunday television as we watch our sports, suicides increasing at staggering proportions among our youth, greed, fraud, immorality, exploding divorce rates, terrific numbers of fatherless children, governmental and political corruption, child abuse, homosexuality, (even among ministers), incest, murder, theft, rape, etc.

Answer for yourself: Why does America today look like Sodom yet there is a church on every corner and the

message of the Gentile Church and the New Testament fills the airways of our televisions?

I thought that God overlooks His Word to fulfill it? There sure is a lot of "His Word" being broadcast (or is it really His Word?). Maybe instead of it being God's Word being broadcast as found in the Bible Jesus used we find that it is a collection of words that took 1000 years to be established by the Roman Catholic Church as a "replacement word" & "another Gospel" that nullified the Bible Jesus used and the true message he taught and gave his life for.

Answer for yourself: Could this possibly be a contributing factor to the mess we find ourselves in today in our country today?

Our current state of affairs in the Christian world is directly linked to the canon of the New Testament as used as the "Standard" for our lives today.

Let's get real for a moment. You can tell if the "Standard" you have been given by the Gentile Christian Church is working or not by taking a look at the fruit of our "religious nation."

Ask yourself if Christianity returned to the canon and Bible of Jesus, where the Commandments of God were taught and venerated instead of a gospel which advocated "grace and not being under these Laws" ...then would the faith and teachings of Jesus as taken from his canon of Scripture affect the moral and ethical conditions of America and of the world more than a man-made canon of the Roman Catholic Church?

Answer for yourself: Where is the beef? It has been, and always will be in the Bible Jesus used...the Jewish Scriptures.

WELL ARE YOU ADVOCATING WE THROW OUT OUR NEW TESTAMENTS?

Absolutely not! Contained within the pages of our New Testaments are living "pictures" which reveal to us how we as non-Jews are to relate to the God of Israel. However, along with much "life" is "death" from man's additions, deletions, changes, and hidden agendas intended to remove us not only from the Bible Jesus used but his religion as well. You will come to see that the Early Church Fathers never intended the collection of writings to replace the Jewish Scriptures; at least not in the beginning. Every Gentile who came to Christ in the first centuries were called God-Fearers and accepted the yoke of the Torah, and obeyed the Law of Noah as given by the Apostle James (who headed up the Messianic Movement of Jesus) in Jerusalem. I believe that divorcing the church from its Jewish heritage and replacing the Jewish Bible with a New Testament has caused a great many of the problems facing us today. We at Bet Emet Ministries believes that if every Christian would return to the original teachings and Religious Belief System of Jesus that many of our problems, both individually and corporately, would be corrected.

We need to return to our Jewish Roots of the Christian faith and discern those parts of our New Testaments which are placed there with the intent of removing us from the faith (Sinai Religion) of Jesus. We need our New Testaments to accomplish this monumental task. **But, we must constantly remember that the words in our New Testament were copied, transmitted, edited, translated, defined canonized by people who had very specific agendas and beliefs; namely to replace the Hebraic Messianic version of Christianity with a purely separated Gentile mixed paganism.** Let us never forget that the Roman Catholic model for

Protestantism today is a creation of Romans and Gentiles and not of a Jew named Jesus! Let us never forget that our churches of today, unless following a return to the true religion of Jesus, are far off the track. Please consider joining God and people like those of Bet Emet who have dedicated their lives to rediscovering the Jewish Jesus so that we can look at his words and the words of the Bible through Jewish eyes and truly then have "the mind of Christ". If you haven't thought about it, to have the "mind of Christ" is to have the same mind, will, emotions, attitudes, concepts, conduct, and religious dogmas, doctrines, and beliefs of the Jewish man named Jesus. It is a Jewish mindset, a Biblical mindset; not a Greek pagan mindset.

HOW CAN WE FIND OUR WAY BACK TO PLEASING G-D?

It is not too late if we seriously confront the issues addressed by Bet Emet and others and repent when shown and proven of our errors and mistakes. The first thing one must do is to see if what I have told you is true or not. You cannot do that on emotion alone; only a serious study into the New Testament will provide the answers you seek and deserve.

It is with this intent that I dedicate this web-site to YHVH as [we endeavor to return to the faith once given to the saints; the faith of Yeshua build upon the Jewish Scriptures](#). In the pages that follow I will lay out for you how the Jewish Scriptures were purposely mistranslated 200 years before the birth of Jesus and how such concepts which were added to the Greek translation of the Jewish Bible were later, following the crucifixion of Jesus, applied to him. Such concepts of the Greek-Jews in Alexandria, Egypt, were a synthesis of Pythagorean-Buddhist Essenes. Their corruption of the Jewish Bible in translation introduced false "doctrines and dogmas" into the Holy texts. The fruit of such was the creation of a second religious text which was to become the Bible of the Greek-speaking world. This would serve as the background for all later translations and subsequently be used and quoted in the New Testament. Needless to say this corruption of truth would be assimilated by the Greek philosophers who, being the intellectuals of their day, would later write the documents we have collected today as the writings of the Early Church Fathers. In other words, the corruption of the Jewish Bible Jesus used has come down to us today and we unsuspectingly read our Bibles never knowing that these corruptions are in it not that Jesus never believed such falsehoods. He knew better and it is time that you do as well. Let us begin now a serious study into the canonization of the New Testament and then, and only then, once seeing the information for yourself, will you be able to make an intelligent decision in this matter.

[CONTINUE](#)



bennoah1@verizon.net



20%^{off} on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



BET EMET MINISTRIES

HEBREW FOR "HOUSE OF TRUTH"

PASTOR CRAIG M. LYONS Ms.D., D.D., M.DIV.



AN UNBIASED LOOK INTO THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...AND DETERMINATION OF THE ROLE OF THE HOLY SPIRIT IN ITS CANONIZATION

You are about to undertake one of the most challenging studies of your life. As a Christian and follower of Jesus you rely upon the New Testament for the foundation of your religious belief system. Sadly few Christians ever study in-dept the origin of Christianity let alone the origin of the New Testament. Over the years of my Pastorate following Seminary I used the tools of study which I was equipped with during my Seminary training to look into the truth concerning the New Testament. This study took years and the results of it led to my resignation from the Pastorate as I became thoroughly convinced of the forgeries contained in this New Testament which had caused me to think I was a follower of Jesus but in reality I was not. This I don't expect the reader to believe at this point but if you can find the courage, patience, and time to devote to the study of the information contained in this website then you will be convinced beyond any doubt when you conclude your study. I will say: "Believe nothing; study everything and use the mind God gave you to see the picture that develops as you study the materials below." May our L-rd and God give you the grace necessary for this very difficult study and let us both remember that God never gave us a lie; antisemitic men did. Craig M. Lyons M.Div.

NECESSARY INTRODUCTORY BACKGROUND INFORMATION

INTO THE CONFLICTING RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEMS AS FOUND IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

- [Is The New Testament Responsible For The Holocaust And Why?](#)
- [Overall View Of The New Testament Documents...The Reason For The Confusion](#)
- [Is The New Testament Inspired, Infallible, And Inerrant?](#)
- [Necessary Background Information For Understanding The New Testament Correctly](#)
- [Our First New Testament As Created By Marcion: A Critical-Historical Study](#)
- [Marcion And The First New Testament...Was It From God?](#)
- [Did You Know That Your New Testament Is Far From Inerrant And Infallible?](#)
- [How Did We Get So Far Off Track...Yet We Had A Bible?](#)
- [Anti-Semitism And Its Prevalence In Christian Theology In The New Testament](#)
- [The Conflict With Judaism And Gentile Hellenism As Found In The New Testament](#)
- [New Testament Transmission...Can We Be Assured Of Truth?](#)

HOW WELL DO YOU KNOW YOUR BIBLES?

- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 1](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 2](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 3](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 4](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 5](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 6](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 7](#)
- [How Well Do You Understand The Bible That You Use For Your Faith And Practice No. 8](#)

INTRODUCTION INTO NEW TESTAMENT STUDIES...GENERAL SURVEY

- [Brief History Of The New Testament...What Your Pastor And Church Never Told You About The New Testament](#)
- [The Development Of The Biblical Canon...Timeline](#)
- [The Role Of The New Testament And Its Authority For Believers No.1](#)
 - [The Role Of The New Testament And Its Authority For Believers No. 2](#)
 - [The Role Of The New Testament And Its Authority For Believers No. 3](#)
- [Have You Ever Noticed That "Alleged" Quotes From The Old Testament As Used In The New Testament Are NOT In The Hebrew Scriptures At All?](#)
- [When Is A Book Not An "Inspired Book"?](#)
- [Religious Fact Or Fiction: What Do You Prefer?](#)
- [What Should We Do With An Unreliable New Testament?](#)
- [As A New Testament Christian...Are You Really A Follower Of Yeshua/Jesus?](#)

WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR FORGOT TO TELL YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT...BECAUSE THEY SIMPLY DON'T KNOW OF THIS KNOWLEDGE

[Introduction...The Importance Of This Study](#)

- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 1](#)

- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 2](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 3](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 4](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 5](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 6](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 7](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 8](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 9](#)
- [What Your Church And Pastor Never Told You About The New Testament No. 10](#)

THE TRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES INTO GREEK...THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BACKGROUND FOR THE NEW TESTAMENT

[SEPTUAGINT STUDIES...THE PROBLEMS WITH THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH BIBLE...AND THE PURPOSEFUL MISTRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES BY THE GREEK-ESSENES OF ALEXANDRIA, EGYPT](#)

AN UNBIASED LOOK AT THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE SCHOLARS...WE NEED TO LISTEN TO THEM](#)

[AN UNBIASED LOOK AT THE ORIGIN OF THE GOSPELS....BY WHOM, WHEN, WHERE?](#)

[AN UNBIASED LOOK AT THE GOSPELS AND THE SILENCE OF JUSTIN MARTYR IN 150 A.D.](#)

[IRENÆUS' REFERENCE TO THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW IN 200 A.D.....WAS IT REALLY TO THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS INSTEAD?](#)

EARLY CONTROVERSIES THAT INFLUENCED THE PRODUCTION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

[EARLY CONTROVERSIES THAT INFLUENCED THE NEED FOR A NEW TESTAMENT](#)

IMPORTANT STUDIES IN THE FORMATION OF THE CANON OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

[THE BOOKS WHICH WERE AT FIRST NOT CONSIDERED INSPIRED....WHICH WE HAVE TODAY](#)

[WERE THE CHURCH FATHERS COMPETENT TO DECIDE THE BOOKS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT?](#)

THE CRITICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY INTO THE CANONIZATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT THAT WE HAVE TODAY.....CAN THIS BE THE FRUIT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT?

[INTRODUCTION](#)

THE SECOND CENTURY

[MARCION](#)

[IRENAEUS](#)

[THE MURATORIAN CANON](#)

THE THIRD CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 3rd CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

THE FOURTH CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 4th CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

THE FIFTH CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 5th CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

THE SIXTH CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 6th CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

THE SEVENTH THROUGH THE TENTH CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 7th THROUGH THE 10th CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

THE 16TH CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 16th CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

THE 17TH CENTURY

[THE TESTIMONY OF THE 17th CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?](#)

CONCLUSION

[THE INESCAPABLE CONCLUSION](#)



bennoah1@verzon.net



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



IS THE NEW TESTAMENT RESPONSIBLE FOR THE THE HOLOCAUST...AND WHY?

Within two decades of the death of Yeshua his followers had begun to attack the Jewish beliefs of their mentor. This phenomenon, by itself, would be worthy of historical inquiry, to determine how the early Christians came to regard the religion of their spiritual founder with such hostility. But the fact of Jew-hating in Christianity is of more than mere psychological or historical interest, for it formed the backdrop to centuries of persecution of Jews and ultimately led to the extermination of over 6 million of them in the Holocaust. One of the purposes of Bet Emet Ministry is to help others look at how the Christian faith formed perceptions of Jews among its adherents and how the attitude of the Church towards them has led to two millennia of strife and agony.

In the wake of the Holocaust Christians and Jews began to search seriously for the factors and causes leading to it. It became apparent to all investigators that the Holocaust could only have occurred in an environment of enormous hatred of Jews and an equal indifference to their suffering by non- participants. For the world allowed this calamity to continue for six years without intervening, as two-thirds of European Jewry was annihilated. While the anti-Semitism of the Holocaust was greater in scope than any previous mass attacks on Jews, it was not different in motive from the Crusades, the Inquisition, or the Eastern European pogroms. Every operation had, as its cause, the hatred of Jews and as its purpose their murder and plunder. In addition to the genocidal scope of the Holocaust, it had one other significant difference from previous catastrophes. There was no physical escape for its victims through conversion as in the preceding anti-Semitic movements. This was anti-Semitism based on racist theory from which there was no escape.

WHAT IS RESPONSIBLE FOR SUCH A CLIMATE OF HATRED TOWARD THE JEWS?

One of the reasons Bet Emet Ministries is devoted to critical study of the New Testament is because it, along with the Gentile Christian Church which created it, is primarily responsible for the deaths of these 6 million Jews plus untoward others through church history. These repeated assaults on Jews are tied to a perception of them as an evil and vicious enemy. As Reverend Robert Everett has pointed out, masses of people have been conditioned to so identify Jews in the course of centuries of Church-inspired vilification of Judaism and its believers. The Church was a seed-bed of anti-Jewish thought for the general populace. In his book, Elder and Younger Brothers, A. Roy Eckardt, minister and professor of religion, asserted that the foundation of anti-Semitism, and the responsibility for the Holocaust lie ultimately in the New Testament. Eckardt further insisted in his book, Your People, My People, that Christian repentance must include a reexamination of basic theological attitudes to Jewry and the New Testament in order to deal effectively with the problem and its prevention. The Catholic theologian and scholar, Father Gregory Baum, wrote, "The Church made the Jewish people a symbol of unredeemed humanity; it painted a picture of Jews as a blind, stubborn, carnal and perverse people, an image that was fundamental in Hitler's choice of the Jews as the scapegoat" (Gregory Baum, Introduction to Faith and Fratricide, p. 7, by Rosemary Radford Ruether). In an editorial Franklin H. Litton wrote, *"Without centuries of anti-Semitic Christian preaching, Hitler could never have mobilized passionate Jew-hates and immobilized dispassionate spectators. The image*

which the Church created could arouse instant contempt and hate of Jews (Franklin H. Littell, "Teaching the Holocaust and Its Lesson" (Editorial), Journal of Ecumenical Studies (21), p. 468, cited in A. Roy Eckardt, *Jews and Christians*, p. 67). This is what Jules Isaac called "the teaching of contempt" (Jules Isaac, The Teaching of Contempt, p. 34. Translated by Helen Weaver, shorter version of Jesus and Israel).

Jewish refusal to recognize Yeshua as the promised messiah (since misery still prevailed in the world and world peace and resurrection of all the dead did not occur during or after the ministry of Yeshua nor were the true Messianic prophecies of the Jewish Bible fulfilled) produced vehement Christian anger and the ardent desire to negate and abolish Judaism. (Gregory Baum, op. Cit., p. 20).

A fundamental reason for this hostility is Gentile Christianity's dependence on Judaism to validate its beliefs and establish its credibility. We basically resent those we depend on and need. Gentile Christianity needed Israel's antiquity and appropriated the latter's lineage to itself. Gentile Christianity based its canon on Hebrew Scriptures and its religion on the God of Israel. The new faith proceeded to adapt those Scriptures and concept of God to its own purposes. The Church claimed to be the natural heir of Judaism and denied any discontinuity with the parent. Christians became the New Israel. The New Covenant replaced the Old. When Jews answered that the Law given by God could not be repealed, annulled, or replaced, they denied Christianity the proof and authority it needed from Judaism. This denial aroused frustration which translated into antagonism and hostility.

For these and other reasons, Bet Emet Ministries studies in-depth the foundation and very essence of Christianity, the New Testament, and the social-historical elements which influenced its contents. We focus on the overall misinterpretations and misunderstandings in the Christian Scriptures (the Greek Scriptures). There are entire learned works dealing specifically with certain aspects or problems of the New Testament such as pre-Christian philosophies influencing the new religion, the beliefs and impact of the Pharisees during the time of Yeshua, the Sanhedrin's relationship to Yeshua's trial, historical events during and after Yeshua's life, Paul's role in the development of Christianity, and his attitude to the Torah. The articles in this series will be attempts to present in summary fashion pertinent subjects in summary rather than in detail, and footnoted with appropriate documentation.

Too often those who read our articles believe our stance and our position on matters to be just "our opinion." I assure you that when you read our articles you encounter a research paper and not a flippant off the cuff idea espoused by someone who has not done the necessary inquiry to arrive at the facts which determine truth.

In order to understand the tragic history and contemporary problems confronting today's Christian to which the vast majority are unaware, I will attempt in these articles to at first include a brief review of highlights in Jewish history prior to the advent of Christianity. It is hoped that an overall survey of conditions at the time of Yeshua's birth, along with a description of important movements at the dawn of Christianity as a new religion, will provide an adequate foundation to aid us later in further investigation.

SO HOW DID CHRISTIANITY GET SO FAR OFF TRACK?

Basically the New Testament is not a continuation of the Jewish Scriptures regardless of what you may have heard. Most are not aware of this because of their lack of knowledge of the Jewish Scriptures (Old Testament). We are told repeatedly that the New Testament is the Old Testament "fulfilled." Is it really? We accept this stance from our spiritual leaders without question.

You need to understand at the beginning that the authors of the Gospels and the Epistles quoted freely from Hebrew Scriptures, for that was their Bible too and the only one in existence. **They used certain techniques, the purpose and effect of which were to discredit the Torah and its followers and to show the superiority of their doctrines over Jewish beliefs.** This is not our opinion, but a factual conclusion when all the evidence is presented and evaluated with an open mind. I am sorry to say you cannot read just 4 pages or 9 pages and get it all. But I make a promise to you....if you will be diligent to read these articles in series....and

study them...and think about what will be presented....even a blind man could see what I am saying once you have an adequate understanding of the dynamics and deceptions involved in the creation of the anti-Semitic New Testament which is responsible for the shedding of blood of over 6 million Jews.

HOW DID THE ROME AND THE WRITERS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT ACCOMPLISH THE GENOCIDE OF THE JEWISH PEOPLE?

Before we continue let me ask you to be truthful with yourself when answering these next questions for the answer you give will determine if you are capable of learning truth when your now-existing values are challenged.

Answer for yourself: Do you consider yourself an authority on the Jewish Scriptures (the Old Testament)?

Answer for yourself: Do you read and speak Greek and Hebrew and feel confident about your abilities to translate Greek and Hebrew into the English?

Answer for yourself: If you do not read or speak Greek or Hebrew, are you well equipped to use Greek or Hebrew study aids in your study of the Bible?

Answer for yourself: When reading the New Testament, are you aware when reading a text that what you are reading is a quote from the Hebrew Scriptures (Old Testament)?

Answer for yourself: When reading the New Testament when it quotes from the Old Testament, are you confident that the New Testament quote has been quoted accurately?

Answer for yourself: Are you so well versed with the Old Testament that you could spot an Old Testament passage misquoted in the New Testament?

Answer for yourself: Are you so well versed with the Old Testament that you could recognize a New Testament passage as a combination of parts of two different passages in the Old Testament which have not only two different contexts but originally two different intended meanings?

Humbly speaking, this is the advantage that other ministries, as well as Bet Emet, bring to help you, the student, come to a more truthful understanding of your faith as God originally intended it. It takes years to develop these above talents, but without them you are literally led astray by the New Testament which was literally created by the Gentile church to serve as their authority to create a new religion that they hoped would replace Biblical Judaism. They have almost succeeded.

If you take what I am saying seriously, then you will come to understand upon reading our articles that a frequently used technique by the writers in the New Testament was to detach verses from their original context in the Hebrew Bible and to attribute an entirely different meaning to them in the New Testament that the original writer never intended.

Answer for yourself: What should be your reaction when you finally begin to see this for yourself?

Another practice was to mistranslate or misquote verses from the Hebrew in order to give them a different meaning which suited the writer and his theology which was different than the original writer's. One of the reasons for this was the use by New Testament writers of the Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible which had numerous inaccuracies. In fact, other than the first 5 books of the Jewish Scripture (The Torah), no Jew was involved in the translation of the Hebrew into the Greek. Such translation, or should I say "purposeful mistranslation" was entirely a Gentile accomplishment! Thus the garbled verses lost all sense of their original meaning. They were then used to prove or substantiate the thesis of

the Gospel or Epistle author in spite of the original intended meaning that was conveyed by the Prophet or Moses.

Answer for yourself: What should be your reaction when you finally begin to see this for yourself?

Sometimes distinct and unrelated passages in the Hebrew Bible were combined to make a continuous sentence which then naturally conveyed a different meaning from that of each of its parts within the original context.

Biblical scholars might protest here that Jews detached verses from their context also in the Midrash and Haggadic sections of the Talmud. However, neither of these bodies of literature are authoritative for Jews. Only the Tanakh (the Hebrew Bible comprising the Law, Prophets, and the Writings) and the Halakhic (or legal) part of the Talmud are authoritative in Judaism. The Gospels and Epistles, of course, cannot say that because they are definitely authoritative for Christianity and are part of the Christian canon. Furthermore, Jewish authorities did not allow the indiscriminate detachment of verses from their context even for homiletic and sermonic purposes. The exegesis had to agree with the Oral Tradition. This put a control and limit on taking verses out of context and misinterpreting them. Gentile Christianity has no such limitations imposed upon their sermonic preaching which easily can be seen today by just a casual listening to tele-evangelists.

Answer for yourself: What should be your reaction when you finally begin to see this for yourself?

Related to this use of quotations from the *Tanakh* was the employment of Old Testament symbols to fit the doctrines of the New Testament authors which were foreign to the doctrines first connected to the symbols originally.

Besides altering words and meanings, the evangelists, authors of the Gospels, and the apostles, writers of the Epistles or letters, also used Hebrew Biblical symbols in such a way as to contradict and undermine the original Jewish significance. Examples of Hebrew symbols which underwent considerable change in Christian literature were the "suffering servant" and the messiah which ended up in Christian literature with very un-Jewish meanings attached to them which the original writers never intended them to have.

Often passages in the Gospels and Acts were severed from their context and/or mistranslated or misquoted on purpose to serve the religious interests of the Gentile writers and redactors of the New Testament.

Aside from misconstruing verses from the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament authors made direct, hostile charges against Jews and disparaging statements against them. Although the Gospels *tell* about events which occurred prior to those reflected in the Epistles, most of the latter were written *before* all the Gospels and Acts were composed. The seven basic Epistles of Paul (I Thessalonians, 1 Corinthians, 2 Corinthians, Philippians, Galatians, Romans, and Philemon) were completed more than a decade before the first Gospel was written. It seems logical, therefore, to discuss those anti-Jewish passages and accusations in the letters of Paul and his contemporaries before examining comparable verses in the Gospels. Furthermore, at least one Gospel writer, Luke, was influenced by Paul and his ideas.

As we progress in this series of articles I will examine and expose those aspects of the Pauline Epistles and other letters which are an expression of the rivalry between the established religion of Judaism and the emerging faith of Gentile Christianity. The letters written by Paul and his allies and adversaries must be viewed in the light of this competition between the two religions and in terms of Paul's cultural roots and religious background. It is easier to understand Paul's statements repudiating the Torah when we appreciate "where Paul is coming from" and where he wanted to go.

Lastly we will deal with those anti-Jewish passages in the Gospels and Acts which reflect not only the animosity of the Gospel writers but the historical events and powerful political movements that influenced them. An example of this type of anti-Jewish accusations is the spurious charge that the Jews

crucified Yeshua or were responsible for his death.

Much of the historical material presented in this series of articles comes from contemporaneous writings of Roman and Jewish historians such as Josephus, the writings of the Nazarenes and the early Christians, and Rabbinical tractates in the Mishna and Talmud. The Mishna is actually part of the Talmud. The Mishna is a commentary and codification of Jewish law. It was redacted around 200 C.E. Some material dates from the first century B.C.E. The Mishna and Gemara comprise the Talmud. The Gemara consists of commentary, discussion, interpretation, and elaboration of the Mishna. There are two Talmuds: Babylonian and Jerusalem; each contains a different Gemara. Both Talmuds were developed in great academies of Jewish learning over a period of centuries. The Jerusalem Talmud was completed around the year 400 C.E. while the Babylonian Talmud was completed by about 500 C.E.

Inasmuch as the New Testament covers a wide variety of topics, I have chosen to shorten my articles somewhat by discussing such topics individually and concisely. Hopefully this makes for greater ease in understanding the material involved. Overall those who read our articles voice disagreements because they lack the necessary foundations to make intelligent decisions about much of what they speak. This is understandable since most Christians are acquainted mainly with the New Testament and have such a limited knowledge and understanding of the Jewish Scriptures (Old Testament). I suppose that this should be expected. Still, it makes my job harder and I hope breaking these articles down to “bite-size” tid-bits will help more read and understand the information at hand which is necessary for comprehending the events discussed correctly.

My goal is to present enough information to restore an accurate interpretation of the Christian Scriptures as well as reveal which parts of them, as we have had them passed down to us, are nothing but fraudulent additions of an anti-Semitic Roman establishment intended to replace the religion of Yeshua with a religion about him.

In the articles which follow, after laying a foundation necessary to proceed, we then will compare New Testament text with Old Testament text, line upon line, precept upon precept and see if the New Testament writers did injustice to the Jewish Scriptures. You will be amazed like I was. **No longer will you be able to read the New Testament and accept what it says without question.** After reading the following articles, you will be able to recognize for yourself the corruption and creationism of the New Testament which does great harm to the true Jewish Scriptures. Just for your benefit let me summarize what we will see when we begin to compare text with text. **We will find that the New Testament writers used certain literary techniques, the purpose and effect of which were to discredit the Torah and its followers and to show the superiority of their doctrines over Jewish beliefs. Those will include the following:**

- **They New Testament writers detached verses from their original context in the Hebrew Bible and attributed an entirely different meaning to them in the New Testament that the original writer never intended.**
- **The New Testament writers mistranslated verses from the Hebrew of the Jewish Scriptures in order to give them a different meaning which suited the writer and his theology which was different than the original writer's.**
- **The New Testament writers misquoted passages from the Jewish Scriptures in order to give them a different meaning which suited the writer and his theology which was different than the original writer's.**
- **The New Testament writers often combined distinct and unrelated passages in the Hebrew Bible to make a continuous sentence which then naturally conveyed a different meaning from that of each of its parts within the original context.**
- **The New Testament writers employed Old Testament symbols to fit the doctrines of the New Testament authors which were foreign to the doctrines first connected to the symbols originally.**
- **The New Testament writers used Hebrew Biblical symbols in such a way as to contradict and undermine the original Jewish significance.**

- **The New Testament writers often severed from their original meanings Jewish Scriptures from their original context and/or mistranslated or misquoted on purpose to serve the religious interests of the Gentile writers and redactors of the New Testament.**
- **Aside from misconstruing verses from the Hebrew Bible, the New Testament authors made direct, hostile charges against Jews and disparaging statements against them.**

Answer for yourself: What kind of authority should such a document carry in your religious belief system when you finally see these things in forthcoming articles for yourself?

Answer for yourself: Do you realize that if you were in high-school English class, and you were called on to write a research paper, that if you misquoted your sources, combined quotes from your sources into a single quote and tried to pass it off as if was an original quote as did the authors of the New Testament, yet saying nothing about purposeful mistranslations, then your teacher would have given you a “F” on that paper?

But wait a minute; maybe not. It is possible she was not familiar with your sources and would not have ever noticed. She might have read your paper trusting you for the work you represented. She might have trusted your commitment to truth. She might have trusted the integrity she felt you had. Such is the case with Christianity for the most part and the non-Jews’ unfamiliarity with the Jewish Scriptures.

All along you, who wrote the paper, would feel “safe,” for after all, what are the chances she would look up your references and check you out?

Well, I and many others have checked the original sources and we have found that an “F” is a generous grade for the New Testament considering what we discovered. I cannot take all the credit for coming to these truths, because I was helped along the way by many men and women who prepared the way for me through their diligent study of the documents. To them I give credit. And to you I make my research available. May you be blessed by it. **Repentance in our religious belief systems is the order for the day!**

Let us begin our quest with the next article in this series.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



OVERALL VIEW OF THE NEW TESTAMENT DOCUMENTS...THE REASON FOR THE CONFUSION

THE FOUR GOSPELS

With these four brief biographies, the Four Gospels, Christianity must stand or fall. These four documents, it is admitted, contain practically all the evidence which can be adduced in proof of the divinity of Jesus Christ. Secular history, affords no proof of this. The so-called apocryphal literature of the early church has been discarded by the church itself. Even the remaining canonical books of the New Testament are of little consequence if the testimony of the Four Evangelists can be successfully impeached and shown to be in error. If one is able to disprove the authenticity and credibility of these documents then the Christian must not only reevaluate his faith in light of such evidence, but the portrayal of Yeshua as a Christian deity is removed to the mythical realm of Apollo, Odin, and Osiris.

WHEN WERE THEY WRITTEN, BY WHOM, AND WHAT CAN WE TRUST IN THEM?

The Four Gospels, it is claimed, were written by Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, two of them apostles, and two companions of the apostles of Christ. I wish that were true, but it is not. If this claim be true the other writings of the apostles, the writings of the Apostolic Fathers, and the writings of the early Christian Fathers, ought to contain some evidences of the fact. We will see shortly that the silence of such writers and the absence from quotes from these "named Gospels" is quite troublesome to the early dating of such documents as originating from these Apostolic authorities. This means that these "Gospels" did not exist at such times or else quotes from such "named Gospels" would be found in the earliest writings of the Early Church Fathers and they are not. This means simply that with such a lack of testimony that it would have been impossible for the actual apostles of Yeshua to have been their authors or else the earliest prolific Early Church writers would have quoted from such "named" Gospels and they do not!

Twenty books—nearly all of the remaining books of the New Testament—are said to have been written by the three apostles, Peter, John, and Paul, a portion of them after the first three Gospels were written; but it is admitted that they contain no evidence whatever of the existence of these Gospels.

There are extant writings accredited to the Apostolic Fathers, Clement of Rome, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp; written, for the most part, early in the second century. These writings contain no mention of the Four Gospels. Understand that even in the early part of the second century we do not find quotes from the Church Fathers designating such "gospels" as those of "Matthew, Mark, Luke, John." These "names were simply added later to the "accepted theology" of the Early Church

Fathers. This also is admitted by Christian scholars. Dr. Dodwell says:

"We have at this day certain most authentic ecclesiastical writers of the times, as Clemens Romanus, Barnabas, Hermas, Ignatius, and Polycarp, who wrote in the order wherein I have named them, and after all the writers of the New Testament. But in Hermas you will not find one passage or any mention of the New Testament, nor in all the rest is any one of the Evangelists named" (Dissertations upon Irenaeus).

THE FOUR GOSPELS WERE UNKNOWN TO THE EARLY CHRISTIAN FATHERS

Justin Martyr, the most eminent of the early Fathers, wrote about the middle of the second century. His writings in proof of the divinity of Christ demanded the use of these Gospels had they existed in his time. He makes more than three hundred quotations from the books of the Old Testament, and nearly one hundred from the Apocryphal books of the New Testament; but none from the Four Gospels.

Answer for yourself: If they were available, don't you think he could have referred to at least one of them in his apologetics toward the Jews?

The Rev. Dr. Giles says:

"The very names of the Evangelists, Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John, are never mentioned by him [Justin]—do not occur once in all his writings" (Christian Records, p. 71).

Papias, another noted Father, was a contemporary of Justin. He refers to writings of Matthew and Mark, but his allusions to them clearly indicate that they were not the Gospels of Matthew and Mark. Dr. Davidson, the highest English authority on the canon, says:

"He [Papias] neither felt the want nor knew the existence of inspired Gospels" (Canon of the Bible, p. 123).

THE "NAMED" GOSPELS SHOW UP IN THE LATTER HALF OF THE SECOND CENTURY

Theophilus, who wrote after the middle of the latter half of the second century, mentions the Gospel of John, and Irenaeus, who wrote a little later, mentions all of the Gospels, and makes numerous quotations from them. The evidence and facts before us show us that it was in the latter half of the second century, then, between the time of Justin and Papias, and the time of Theophilus and Irenaeus, the Four Gospels were undoubtedly written or compiled. That means 150-180 C.E.

These books are anonymous. They do not purport to have been written by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John. Their titles do not affirm it. They simply imply that they are "according" to the supposed teachings of these Evangelists. As Renan says, "They merely signify that these were the traditions proceeding from each of these Apostles, and claiming their authority." Concerning their authorship the Rev. Dr. Hooykaas says:

"They appeared anonymously. The titles placed above them in our Bibles owe their origin to a later ecclesiastical tradition which deserves no confidence whatever" (Bible for Learners, Vol. III, p. 24).

It is claimed that the Gospel of Matthew originally appeared in Hebrew. Our version is a translation of a Greek

work. Regarding this St. Jerome says:

"Who afterwards translated it into Greek is not sufficiently certain."

The consequences of this admission are thus expressed by Michaelis:

"If the original text of Matthew is lost, and we have nothing but a Greek translation; then, frankly, we cannot ascribe any divine inspiration to the words."

THE INTERNAL EVIDENCE FROM THESE GOSPELS BETRAY THAT THEY WERE NOT WRITTEN BY JEWS LET ALONE THE APOSTLES OF JESUS

The contents of these books refute the claim that they were written by the Evangelists named. They narrate events and contain doctrinal teachings which belong to a later age. Matthew ascribes to Christ the following language. "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church" (Matt. 16:18). This Gospel is a Roman Catholic Gospel, and was written after the beginning of the establishment of this hierarchy to uphold the supremacy of the Petrine Church of Rome. Of this Gospel Dr. Davidson says:

"The author, indeed, must ever remain unknown" (Introduction to New Testament, p. 72).

The Gospel of Luke is addressed to Theophilus. Theophilus, Bishop of Antioch, who is believed to be the person addressed, flourished in the latter half of the second century.; therefore the authorship of the Lukan writings is in serious doubt!

Dr.Schleiermacher, one of Germany's greatest theologians, after a critical analysis of Luke, concludes that it is merely a compilation, made up of thirty-three preexisting manuscripts. Bishop Thirlwall's Schleiermacher says:

"He [Luke] is from beginning to end no more than the compiler and arranger of documents which he found in existence" (p. 313).

The basis of this Gospel is generally believed to be the Gospel of Marcion, a Pauline compilation, made about the middle of the second century. Concerning this Gospel, the Rev. S. Baring-Gould, in his Lost and Hostile Gospels, says:

"The arrangement is so similar that we are forced to the conclusion that it (Marcion's Gospel) was either used by St. Luke or that it was his original composition. If he used it then his right to the title of author of the Third Gospel falls to the ground, as what he added was of small amount."

Mark, according to Renan, is the oldest of the Gospels; but Mark, according to Strauss, was written after the Gospels of Matthew and Luke were written. He says: "It is evidently a compilation, whether made from memory or otherwise, from the first and third Gospels" (Leben Jesu, p. 51). Judge Waite, in his History of Christianity, says that all but twenty-four verses of this Gospel have their parallels in Matthew and Luke. Davidson declares it to be an anonymous work. "The author," he says, "is unknown."

Omitting the last twelve verses of Mark, which all Christian critics pronounce spurious, the book contains no mention of the two great miracles which mark the limits of Christ's earthly career, his miraculous birth and his ascension.

Concerning the first three Gospels, the Encyclopedia Britannica says:

"It is certain that the Synoptic Gospels took their present form only by degrees."

Of these books Dr. Westcott says:

"Their substance is evidently much older than their form."

Professor Robertson Smith pronounces them *"unapostolic digests of the second century."*

THE NON-SYNOPTIC GOSPEL OF JOHN

The internal evidence against the authenticity of the Fourth Gospel is conclusive. The Apostle John did not write it. John, the apostle, was a Jew; the author of the Fourth Gospel was not a Jew. John was born at Bethsaida; the author of the Fourth Gospel did not know where Bethsaida was located. John was an uneducated fisherman; the author of this Gospel was an accomplished scholar. Some of the most important events in the life of Jesus, the Synoptics declare, were witnessed by John; the author of this knows nothing of these events. The Apostle John witnessed the crucifixion; the author of this Gospel did not. The Apostles, including John, believed Jesus to be a man; the author of the Fourth Gospel believed him to be a god.

Regarding the authorship of the Fourth Gospel, Dr. Davidson says:

"The Johannine authorship has receded before the tide of modern criticism, and though this tide is arbitrary at times, it is here irresistible" (Canon of the Bible, p. 127).

That the authenticity of the Four Gospels cannot be maintained is conceded by every impartial critic. The author of Supernatural Religion, in one of the most profound and exhaustive works on this subject ever written, expresses the result of his labors in the following words:

"After having exhausted the literature and the testimony bearing on the point, we have not found a single distinct trace of any of those Gospels during the first century and a half after the death of Jesus" (Supernatural Religion, Vol. II, p. 248).

Fifteen hundred years ago, Bishop Faustus, a heretical Christian theologian, referring to this so-called Gospel history, wrote:

"It is allowed not to have been written by the son himself nor by his apostles, but long after by some unknown men who, lest they should be suspected of writing things they knew nothing of, gave to their books the names of the Apostles."

The following is the verdict of the world's greatest Bible critic, Baur:

"These Gospels are spurious, and were written in the second century."

ACTS, THE CATHOLIC EPISTLES, AND REVELATION

The Acts of the Apostles is supposed to have been written by the author of the Third Gospel. Like this book it is anonymous and of late origin. It contains historical inaccuracies, contradicts the Gospel of Matthew, and conflicts with the writings of Paul. Concerning the last, the Bible for Learners (Vol. III, p. 25) says:

"In the first two chapters of the Epistle to the Galatians, he [Paul] gives us several details of his own past life; and no sooner do we place his story side by side with that of the Acts than we clearly

perceive that this book contains an incorrect account, and that its inaccuracy is not the result of accident or ignorance, but of a deliberate design."

This book purports to be the product chiefly of three minds: that of the author who gives a historical sketch of the early church, and those of Peter and Paul whose discourses are reported. And yet the three compositions are clearly the products of one mind—that of the author. The evident purpose of the work is to heal the bitter dissensions which existed between the Petrine and Pauline churches, and this points unmistakably to the latter part of the second century as the date of its appearance, when the work of uniting the various Christian sects into the Catholic church began. Renan considers this the most faulty book of the New Testament.

The seven Catholic Epistles, James, First and Second Peter, First, Second and Third John, and Jude, have never been held in very high esteem by the church. Many of the Christian Fathers rejected them, while modern Christian scholars have generally considered them of doubtful authenticity. The first and last of these were rejected by Martin Luther.

"St. James' Epistle," says Luther, "is truly an epistle of straw" (Preface to Luther's New Testament, ed. 1524).

Jude, he says, *"is an abstract or copy of St. Peter's Second, and allegeth stories and sayings which have no place in Scripture"* (Standing Preface).

The First Epistle of Peter and the First Epistle of John have generally been accorded a higher degree of authority than the others; but even these were not written by apostles, nor in the first century. Dr. Soury says that First Peter

"dates, in all probability, from the year 130 A D., at the earliest" (Jesus and the Gospels, p. 32).

Irenaeus, the founder of the New Testament canon, rejected it. The Dutch critics, who deny the Johannine authorship of the Fourth Gospel, and assign its composition to the second century, say

"The First Epistle of John soon issued from the same school in imitation of the Gospel" (Bible for Learners, Vol. III p. 692).

Second Peter is a forgery. Westcott says there is no proof of its existence prior to 170 A.D. Smith's Bible Dictionary says,

"Many reject the epistle as altogether spurious."

The brief epistles of Second and Third John are anonymous and of very late origin. They do not purport to be the writings of John. The superscriptions declare them to be from an elder, and this precludes the claim that they are from an apostle. The early Fathers ignored them. Revelation is the only book in the Bible which claims to be the word of God. At the same time it is the book of which Christians have always been the most suspicious. It is addressed to the seven churches of Asia, but the seven churches of Asia rejected it. Concerning the attitude of ancient churchmen toward it, Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, says:

"Divers of our predecessors have wholly refused and rejected this book, and by discussing the several parts thereof have found it obscure and void of reason and the title forged."

"The most learned and intelligent of Protestant divines," says the Edinburgh Review, "almost all doubted or denied the canonicity of the book of Revelation."

It is a book which, Dr. South said, "either found a man mad or left him so." Calvin and Beza both forbade their clergy to attempt an explanation of its contents. Luther says:

"In the Revelation of John much is wanting to let me deem it either prophetic or apostolical" (Preface to N.T., 1524).

Considered as evidences of Christ's historical existence and divinity these nine books are of no value. They are all anonymous writings or forgeries, and, with the possible exception of Revelation, of very late origin. While they affirm Christ's existence they are almost entirely silent regarding his life and miracles.

THE EPISTLES OF PAUL

Of the fourteen epistles ascribed to Paul, seven—Ephesians, Colossians, Second Thessalonians, First and Second Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews—are conceded by nearly all critics to be spurious, while three others—Philippians, First Thessalonians, and Philemon—are generally classed as doubtful.

The general verdict concerning the first seven is thus expressed by the Rev. Dr. Hooykaas:

"Fourteen epistles are said to be Paul's; but we must at once strike off one, namely, that to the Hebrews, which does not bear his name at all.... The two letters to Timothy and the letter to Titus were certainly composed long after the death of Paul.... It is more than possible that the letters to the Ephesians and Colossians are also unauthentic, and the same suspicion rests, perhaps, on the first, but certainly on the second of the Epistles to the Thessalonians" (Bible for Learners, Vol. III, p. 23).

The author of Second Thessalonians, whose epistle is a self-evident forgery, declares First Thessalonians to be a forgery. Baur and the Tübingen school reject both Epistles. Baur also rejects Philippians:

"The Epistles to the Colossians and to the Philippians . . . are spurious, and were written by the Catholic school near the end of the second century, to heal the strife between the Jew and the Gentile factions" (Paulus).

Dr. Kuenen and the other Dutch critics admit that Philippians and Philemon, as well as First Thessalonians, are doubtful.

That the Pastoral Epistles are forgeries is now conceded by all critics. According to the German critics they belong to the second century. Hebrews does not purport to be a Pauline document. Luther says:

"The Epistle to the Hebrews is not by St. Paul, nor, indeed, by any apostle" (Standing Preface to Luther's N.T.).

Four Epistles—Romans, First and Second Corinthians, and Galatians—while rejected by a few critics, are generally admitted to be the genuine writings of Paul. These books were written, it is claimed, about a quarter of a century after the death of Christ. They are the only books of the New Testament whose authenticity can be maintained.

Admitting the authenticity of these books, however, is not admitting the divine origin of Christianity. Paul was not a witness of the alleged events upon which Christianity rests. He did not become a convert to Christianity until many years after the death of Christ. He did not see Christ (save in a vision); he did not listen to his teachings; he did not learn from his disciples.

"The Gospel which was preached of me is not after man, for I neither received it of man, neither was I taught it" (Gal.1:11-12).

Paul accepted only to a very small extent the religion of Christ's disciples. He professed to derive his knowledge from supernatural sources—from trances and visions. Regarding the value of such testimony the author of Supernatural Religion (p. 970) says:

"No one can deny, and medical and psychological annals prove, that many men have been subject to visions and hallucinations which have never been seriously attributed to supernatural causes. There is not one single valid reason removing the ecstatic visions and trances of the Apostle Paul from this class."

The corporeal existence of the Christ of the Evangelists receives slight confirmation in the writings of Paul. His Christ was not the incarnate Word of John, nor the demi-god of Matthew and Luke. Of the immaculate conception of Jesus he knew nothing. To him Christ was the son of God in a spiritual rather than in a physical sense. "His son Jesus Christ our Lord, which was made of the seed of David according to the flesh; and declared to be the son of God with power, according to the spirit of holiness, by the resurrection from the dead" (Rom. 1:3-4). "God sent forth his son, made of a woman [but not of a virgin], made under the law" (Gal. 4:4).

With the Evangelists the proofs of Christ's divinity are his miracles. Their books teem with accounts of these. But Paul evidently knows nothing of these miracles. With him the evidences of Christ's divine mission are his resurrection and the spiritual gifts conferred on those who accept him.

The Evangelists teach a material resurrection. When the women visited his tomb "they entered in and found not the body of Jesus" (Luke 24:3). The divine messengers said to them, "He is not here, but is risen" (Luke 24:6). "He sat at meat" with his disciples; "he took bread, and blessed it, and brake, and gave to them" (Luke 24:30). "Then he said to Thomas, Reach hither thy finger, and behold my hands; and reach hither thy hand, and thrust it into my side" (John 20:27). **This is entirely at variance with the teachings of Paul.** "But now is Christ risen from the dead, and become the first fruits of them that slept. For since by man came death, by man came also the resurrection of the dead" (I Cor. 15:20-21). "But some man will say, How are the dead raised up? and with what body do they come? Thou fool, that which thou sowest is not quickened, except it die; and that which thou sowest, thou sowest not that body that shall be" (I Cor. 15:35-37). "It is sown a natural body; it is raised a spiritual body. There is a natural body, and there is a spiritual body" (44). "Now this I say brethren, that flesh and blood cannot inherit the kingdom of God" (50).

The Christ that Paul saw in a vision was a spiritual being—an apparition; and this appearance he considers of exactly the same character as the post mortem appearances of Christ to his disciples. "He was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve; after that he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; . . . after that, he was seen of James; then of all the Apostles. And last of all, he was seen of me also" (I Cor. 15:5-8).

CONCLUSION

We have seen that the Four Gospels are not authentic, that they are anonymous writings which appeared late in the second century. If their contents seemed credible and their statements harmonized with each other this want of authenticity would invalidate their authority, because the testimony of an unknown witness cannot be accepted as authoritative. On the other hand, if their authenticity could be established, if it could be shown that they were written by the authors claimed, the incredible and contradictory character of their contents would destroy their authority.

Since children most of us have been told in church that these documents which comprise the New Testament are inspired, infallible, and inerrant," in the light of the information presented above it would behoove us to investigate for ourselves the credibility of such documents. Not only that, but we have been taught that they were written by the closest followers of Yeshua. **As you can see for yourself such is not the case.**

To believe the impossible is gross superstition; to believe the possible, simply because it is possible, is blind

credulity.

These books are presented as the credentials of Christ. A critical analysis of these credentials reveals hundreds of errors. You will see as you proceed through this web site the hundred of misquotations, mistranslation, and verses taken out of context from the Old Testament which not only destroys the intended meaning of the original writer, but cause one today to read and be misled. In fact such distortions cause you to practice another gospel and another religion without ever knowing your are.

Such purposeful deception by the writers of these documents, as well as those who altered them throughout history, has cause you and I to depart from the faith once given to the saints and literally oppose God in many ways in our lives without knowing it. We have followed fables and lies instead of truth. A presentation of these errors along with necessary background information will occupy this web site.

If it can be shown ...AND IT CAN...that they contain errors, however trivial some of them may appear, this refutes the claim of inerrancy and divinity. If it can be shown that these New Testament documents abound with errors, this destroys their credibility as historical documents and their authority for one's faith and practice.

Within these documents are religious truth mixed with religious error. I am often asked by many "how can I tell the difference when reading the New Testament"? It is simple. If you look toward Yeshua as the example that one is to model his life after for godliness, then it is imperative to understand what Yeshua believed about all facets of his faith...Biblical Judaism. Having done that and this required an in-depth study of the tenants of Biblical Judaism, then when reading the New Testament you are then able to read with "radar" spotting those things which are Jewish and Biblical which Yeshua believed and followed as well as "spotting" sayings, passages, and things which oppose Biblical Judaism...the faith of Yeshua. Coupled with this is the necessary study of pagan religion and comparative religion that allows your "radar" to spot the paganism within the pages of both the Christian's Old and New Testaments. In other words you will become adept at spotting "replacement religion" within the Christian's Old and New Testament documents. In order to accomplish such a task I hope to help you in your quest for such truth by exposing to you the knowledge and information gathered over the last 20 years of ministry as we look to both the Christian's Old and New Testament and evaluate if for truth. May God's Holy Word be true and every man a liar who contradicts it and opposes it.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



IS THE NEW TESTAMENT INSPIRED, INFALLIBLE, AND INERRANT?

As Christians, individuals seeking to know and do the will of the Almighty, you are confronted with a significant question: is the New Testament really the Word of God? Your leaders have assured you that the answer is "yes;" perhaps you have even had some emotional experiences which seem to validate your leaders' assurances. As you know, though, true faith is based neither upon trust in men (Ps, 146:3), nor even upon occurrences of the supernatural (Deut. 13). And so, the question remains, your eternal salvation contingent upon the answer.

Following is a short Biblical study, offered in an attempt to help you find the answer. We ask that you complete this study in a spirit of earnestness and prayer, asking God to reveal to you His truth in the quietness of your own heart. As you do so, remember that you are a member of a kingdom of priests and a holy nation (Ex.19:6), described in the Scriptures as the "apple of God's eye" (Zech.2:8) and participants in an "everlasting covenant" (Gen. 17:7). As such, rest assured that God will indeed heed your request as you sincerely seek to discover His truth.

- ITEM 1: Stephen's capsule summary of Jewish History, ostensibly written under the influence of the Holy Spirit (Acts 7:55, 6:10), and an early expression of that anti-Jewish tendency which would later come to characterize the Christian Scriptures (see, e.g., 1 Thes. 2:15, Jn. 8:39-47, Matt. 23:34- 35).

Acts 7:4--Stephen tells us that Abraham departed from Haran "after his father died." Had he studied the Book of Genesis (11:26,32; 12:4), he would have realized his error: Abraham departed from Haran at age 75, at a time when his father Terah was 145; since Terah lived for 205 years, he still had another 60 years of life remaining.

Acts 7:14--Stephen related that 75 of Joseph's relatives were called by him to come to Egypt. Moses saw it differently: see Deut. 10:22, Gen 46:27, Ex. 1:5 (And all the persons who came from the loins of Jacob were 70 in number").

Acts 7:16--Stephen informs us that Jacob was buried in Shechem, and that the tomb was purchased by Abraham from Emmor .

Genesis, again tells a different story. At the death of Sarah his wife, Abraham purchases the Cave of Machpelah, which is in Hebron, as a burial place. The cave is purchased from Ephron the Hittite, contrary to what Steven says in Acts. (Gen.23) It is here that Jacob is buried, as outlined in Genesis 50:13. It was Jacob who purchased a parcel of land in Shechem from Hamor, but it was purchased as a place to pitch his tent and as a place to erect an altar.

- ITEM 2: Did Judas take the silver pieces from the priests and acquire a field with them (Acts 1:18), or did he return the silver pieces and then hang himself (Matt.27:5)?
- ITEM 3: Where in Jeremiah's prophecies does he speak of 30 pieces of silver, as Matthew claims (27:9)? Was not Matthew in fact confusing Jeremiah with Zechariah (see Zech. 11:12-13)?

- ITEM 4: Yeshua himself seems to have been confused by Zechariah. In Matt. 23:25, he informs us that Zechariah, the son of Berechiah, was murdered between the Temple and the altar. Our Scriptures, however, tell a different story: it was Zechariah, the son of Jehoida, who was slain by the altar (2 Chron. 24:20-21), this in the days of the Judean king Joash. There is no indication that the prophet Zechariah, son of Berechiah (Zech. 1:1), was similarly slain.
- ITEM 5: Was the Last Supper a Passover Seder (Matt. 26:17-20, Mk. 14:12, Lk. 22:7) or--rather--the day of preparation for the Passover (Jn. 19:14)?
- ITEM 6: Was John the Baptist Elijah, as Yeshua claimed (Matt. 11:14)? if so, why did John himself deny it (Jn. 1:21)? Would "Elijah" have been so unsure of Yeshua's messianic identity (Lk. 7:19-20)? And where in our Scriptures is it written that Elijah would be mistreated, as Yeshua claimed (Mk. 9:13)? Don't our Scriptures indicate, to the contrary, that Elijah will be successful in his mission of restoring harmony among the people (Mal. 4:5-6)?
- ITEM 7: Was Abiathar the High Priest when David ate the consecrated bread, as Yeshua claimed in justifying his followers' violation of the Sabbath (Mk. 2:25-26)? Why do our Scriptures say that the high priest at the time was Ahimelech (1 Sam. 21:1), the father of Abiathar (1 Sam. 22:20)?
- ITEM 8: Regarding Yeshua's step-father, was he Joseph son of Jacob son of Mattan son of Eliezer (Matt. 1:15-16) or Joseph son of Eli son of Mattat son of Levi (Lk. 3:23-24)? And how can both sets of genealogical tables validly include Shealtiel and Zerubbabel (Matt. 1:12, Lk. 3:27), given that both of these men are descendants of Jeconiah (1 Chron. 3:16-19), of whom God has said, "no man of his seed shall prosper, sitting on the throne of David or ruling any more in Judah" (Jer. 22:30)?
- ITEM 9: Given the new Testament statement that "if Christ has not been raised, your faith is worthless" (1 Cor. 15:17), see if you can possibly reconcile the conflicting accounts of Yeshua's post-resurrection appearances. To cite just one example, did Yeshua, upon arising and reveal himself (a) in Galilee to the eleven remaining disciples (Judas, of course, being absent)--Matt. 26:16, Mk 16:7,14; (b) in Jerusalem to the eleven--Lk. 24:33,36; (c) in Jerusalem to the ten, Thomas being absent--Jn. 20:10,19,24; or (d) to Peter and then to the twelve--1 Cor. 15:5? (Paul's version, choice (d), obviously presents a problem: who were the twelve, since Judas was already dead (Matt. 27:5) and his successor had not yet been chosen (Acts 1:26)?

THE PROBLEMS WITH THE NEW TESTAMENT ONLY BEGIN HERE

If you continue your study of the materials presented on this web site, then you will see beyond any question the misquotations by the New Testament from the Old Testament, the purposeful mistranslations by the New Testament from the Old Testament, the hundreds of verses taken out of context in order to give prophetic credibility to the deceptions passed off as "truth" by the anti-Semitic writers and redactors of the New Testament. Basically what you will see is a "replacement religion" called Gentile Christianity which has destroyed and replaced the Biblical truths of Judaism and the faith of Jesus. Having completed your study of this website, as well as some of the others by this ministry, I am confident that you, like myself, will be forced to begin a serious study of the faith of Yeshua...Biblical Judaism...the only faith every given to man by HaShem. Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



NECESSARY BACKGROUND INFORMATION FOR UNDERSTANDING THE NEW TESTAMENT CORRECTLY

The New Testament, like any other literature, is easier to understand and more interesting when it is seen in its historical context. For a still better picture of the age in which the books of the New Testament were written, it is necessary to step back a bit and review important events in Jewish history leading up to that period. The social, political, and religious conditions in Judea at the time of Christianity's birth are of great significance in understanding the direction which that religion took.

The sects or parties prevalent in Judea at the dawn of Christianity had an impact on early Christians, as well as on Jews. The names--Sadducees, Pharisees, Zealots--are mentioned throughout the Gospels, Acts, and Epistles. The Sanhedrin occupies a significant place in the recounting of Yeshua's trial as does the Roman procurator, Pontius Pilate. No study of the New Testament is complete without an awareness of the character and influence of Paul, the great proselytizer, if not founder, of Christianity. **Paul's role was pivotal in transforming Nazarene Judaism into Gentile Christianity.**

It is hoped that this short presentation about the important people, parties, and institutions during the life of Yeshua and the period in which the New Testament was composed will add to a better understanding and evaluation of the events recounted in Christian Scriptures.

HISTORICAL REVIEW

Let us turn back now to a brief historical review of Jews in their own land in order to gain a clearer perspective of the stage on which events were enacted during the time of Yeshua and Paul, the writing of the New Testament, and the development of Christianity. The historical summary also throws some light on the forces influencing most Jews who clung tenaciously to their land and faith.

After the destruction of the First Temple in Jerusalem and the fall of Judea in 586 B.C.E. many Jews, especially the Jewish leadership and aristocracy in Jerusalem, were sent into exile in Babylonia. Less than fifty years later in 538, the Babylonian Empire fell to Cyrus the Great of Persia. Cyrus was a benign monarch who allowed and encouraged the Jews to return to Judah and rebuild the Temple in Jerusalem. Many welcomed his offer. They returned to their former capital, built a modest Temple, and enjoyed a certain degree of autonomy. Despite some conflicts with the Samaritans, the Jews lived in peace and enjoyed religious freedom. Samaritans were people of diverse origins. They were a mixture of Israelites with people from Central Asia who were settled in Samaria by Sargon after the fall of the Northern Kingdom in 721 B.C.E. The Northern Kingdom was called Israel and contained ten tribes. They were sent into exile by Sargon of Assyria. The Southern Kingdom was called Judah or Judea and included the tribes of Judah and Benjamin. Transfer of populations was common in ancient times. The Samaritans worshipped God and also practiced idolatry. The Jews (Judeans), returning from exile, rejected the Samaritans' offer to help rebuild the Temple. They sensed that their survival depended on the preservation of their religion free from corrupting elements. The Samaritans, thereupon, became the inveterate

foes of the Jews using every unscrupulous method to prevent them from rebuilding their Temple, constructing protective walls around Jerusalem, and establishing themselves in Judea. They told slanderous lies to the Persians in order to prevent or delay construction of the Temple. By 516 B.C.E., despite Samaritan opposition, the Second Temple was completed.

The Persian Empire extended from India to Ethiopia, as stated in the first chapter of the Book of Esther. Some Jews fared well under the Persians and rose to positions of influence. This too is corroborated in Esther even though details of the story are considered literary embellishments by most scholars.

In the ensuing two centuries, Persian imperial power decayed and declined. The independent city-states of Greece were conquered and united by Philip II of Macedon and his son, Alexander. As Alexander rose to power and endeavored to unite the Greek states of Europe and Asia, he met the Persians in combat and overcame them. After two centuries of ascendancy the Persian Empire fell to Alexander the Great of Macedon in 332 B.C.E. The Greeks now ruled all of the known world. Greek civilization or Hellenism spread throughout Europe and the ancient Near Eastern centers of civilization in Asia and North Africa. In 323 Alexander died and his empire was divided among three generals. While Alexander had been friendly to Jews, his successors were not consistently so. Under the Greeks Jews encountered more difficulty and strife than they had under Persian rule. In the Middle East one of Alexander's generals, Ptolemy, received Egypt and another general, Seleucus, acquired Syria. In 310 Ptolemy I declared himself king of Egypt and Judea. The latter included at various times not only the land area of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin but also Samaria, Galilee, and Trans-Jordan. The country was tranquil for the most part under the Ptolemaic hegemony although there were periodic battles on its territory between the Ptolemics and the Seleucids.

In 198 B.C.E. the Syrian Greeks wrested Judea from the Egyptian Greeks. Judea continued at peace for the next thirty years until Antiochus IV ascended the Syrian throne in 168. He attempted to impose his repressive rule on the Jews and to forbid their practice of Judaism. Revolt ensued under the leadership of Mattathias, a priest of Modi'in, a town northwest of Jerusalem. His five sons, Judah, John, Eliezer, Jonathan, and Simon, were known as the Maccabees. The war which the Maccabees fought under the successive command of the various brothers lasted from 168 to 134. It ended with the final liberation of Judea. The country had a measure of independence under the Hasmoneans, the name of the successors of the Maccabees. The Hasmoneans were priest-kings. That is, they ruled as kings and came from the priestly class. The members of the families were regarded as heroes because they had liberated the land from Greek domination. Although their family was not descended from that branch of the priesthood from which the High Priest came, the Maccabees' claim to that role was accepted by the people in light of their leadership role in the wars for religious freedom.

This did not preclude differences with certain elements in the population, especially among the Pharisees, who wished an earlier end to the warfare. The Hasmoneans had nationalistic goals to expand Jewish dominance to the areas that had been part of the kingdom when David and Solomon reigned. The opponents of this view were satisfied to end the state of war as long as the Temple was secured and religious freedom assured.

The Maccabean-Hasmonean dynasty lasted for over one hundred years. During that time Rome replaced Greece as the greatest power in the world. The Romans did, however, absorb and assimilate Hellenism. Greek culture, if not Greek political power, prevailed throughout the Roman Empire. Judea lost its independence in the year 63 B.C.E. with the rivalry of two brothers for the throne: Aristobolus and Hyrcanus. They both appealed to Rome for help and that power played one against the other and finally moved into the breach. Pompey entered Jerusalem with his army. While a Hasmonean sat on the throne for the next two and-a-half decades, there was continuous encroachment by the Romans. The situation deteriorated as Judea lost its independence and Rome became more oppressive.

In 47 B.C.E. Antipater, ruler of Edom (Idumea), became procurator of Judea through political intrigue with the Romans. His son, Herod, continued the crafty maneuvering of his father. He became governor of Galilee. In that position he crushed a revolt of the Jews against Rome which was led by Hezekiah the Zealot. Shortly thereafter, in 40 B.C.E., Herod went to Rome for backing, having already demonstrated his loyalty to that government. The Romans then proclaimed him king of Judea. Herod killed Antigonus, the Hasmonean ruler,

thus ending the dynasty. He undermined the Sanhedrin and the internal organization of the Jewish community. He brought the kingdom of Judea into the Roman Hellenistic orbit. The Jews hated him for Hellenizing their country, for subverting their institutions, and for his wanton brutality. He murdered his Hasmonean wife, Mariamne, and their sons in a psychotic rage. His reign lasted from 37 to 4 B.C.E. Toward the end of his rule a Jewish baby was born in Nazareth, and given the name of Joshua. Years later he became known by the Greek translation of his name, Jesus.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT BY MARCION - A CRITICAL AND HISTORICAL STUDY OF THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

Having grown up in Church all of my life, and having a fairly heavy exposure to Mainstream Christianity, and having familiarity with the Bible, possibly you like I noticed that Mainstream Christianity often de-emphasizes the Old Testament and puts a disproportionate amount of emphasis on Paul's epistles. I would hesitate to say that any part of the Scriptures can be overemphasized. However, if we give uncalled-for weight and emphasis on certain parts of the Bible (like the New Testament), and neglect what the rest of the Scriptures teaches about an issue (especially the Old Testament), we will probably develop an unbalanced view of that particular issue which will lead to a misunderstanding of the issue at hand. Thus our obedience and conduct will be incorrect and possibly sinful because we only looked at a small part of Yahweh's revelation in the Bible. What is most troubling is that often parts of the New Testament which contradict the teachings of Moses and the Prophets are emphasized over the Old Testamentthe only Bible Yeshua knew!

By volume, Paul's epistles make up approximately 5% of the Bible. Paul's writings are considered holy Scripture by Mainstream Christianity, but neither Paul nor the Holy Spirit expected us to give more weight and authority to these epistles than we do to the Old Testament or to the rest of the New Testament, for after all, in Acts 28:23 it is recorded that the Apostle Paul taught "Jesus" as being the Messiah from out of the Law of Moses and the Prophets in the Old Testament.

Answer for yourself: Do you not find it interesting that over 35 years since the cross of Christ we find the Apostle Paul teaching out of the Old Testament and not using his personal letters as Scripture?

By putting a disproportionate amount of emphasis on these letters (only 5 % of the whole Bible) that Paul sent to various churches, we fail to follow the example of Paul, who told the Ephesians, "I have not shunned to declare unto you ALL the counsel of God" (Ac.20:27). By neglecting certain parts of the Bible (95% of which lies outside the Pauline epistles), we ignore Paul's declaration that "all Scripture is inspired and is useful" (2 Tim.3:16). Dear believer when Paul uttered this often quoted saying that "all Scripture is inspired and is useful for doctrine, reproof, correction, and instruction" the bulk of his writings had not even been written yet, and without a doubt, he was referring to the Bible used by Jesus which is the Old Testament which is tragically so overlooked in the churches that bear his name today. In fact the vast majority of churches that bear his name teach just the opposite of what Jesus taught in that they teach the Law (Torah=instruction) has passed away and has been replaced by "grace."

Christianity's strong emphasis on Paul's writings, and lack of emphasis on so much of the rest of the Bible, is puzzling, no only to me but to the many who study the Scriptures in detail. It is especially puzzling when we consider Peter's warning about Paul's writings: "His letters contain some things that are hard to understand, which ignorant and unstable people distort, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction" (2 Pet.3:16).

Answer for yourself: Now don't you think it ironic and puzzling that Christianity today primarily focuses on that 5% of the Bible that even the Apostles who lived with Jesus and headed up his Church found unsettling, difficult to understand, and easily misunderstood?

Answer for yourself: Possibly have we, with all our good intentions, also been misled by what we hear today from those who themselves have misunderstood the often contradictory passages in our Bibles written by Paul? Let me give you one for instance:

LET US LOOK AT JUST ONE OF THE PAULINE CONTRADICTIONS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Paul states in Romans 2:13 that: "For not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified."

Then we see that Paul states in Romans 3:20 that: "Therefore by the deeds of the law there shall no flesh be justified in his sight."

There you have it. Paul states in Romans 2:13 we are justified by deeds of the Law then he contradicts himself in Romans 3:20 by saying that none will be justified by the deeds of the law.

Answer for yourself: Which are we to believe? Are you confused? Is Paul confused? What are we to believe?

Answer for yourself: Is faith without confirming obedience enough for eternal life?

If it was NOT easy for Paul's contemporaries to understand his epistles, we can be sure that it will be even HARDER FOR US to do so, with our limited knowledge of the times, situations and problems Paul was addressing when he wrote to these various churches. Yet some Christians, perhaps unknowingly, are more intent on following the easy-to-misunderstand teachings contained in Paul's letters than they are on following the plain teachings of the Messiah Jesus contained in the Gospels.

HOW DID 5% OF THE BIBLE (PAUL'S LETTERS) BECOME SO IMPORTANT TO THE EXCLUSION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT? ...MARCION GIVES US OUR FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

Answer for yourself: Who is responsible for putting together such conflicting writings and passing them off as an authority for faith and practice, let alone a replacement for the Old Testament?

Answer for yourself: How did this shift of focus come about?

Answer for yourself: What caused the Church to begin paying so much attention to Paul and so little attention to the Law and the Prophets and other parts of the Bible which to Jesus was his whole Bible?

To discover the answer to this question, we must go all the way back to the Second Century. After all the original Apostles had died, other people took on the responsibility of continuing the Church's work. The original Apostles were all Jews, who had been exposed to the teachings of the Law and the Prophets since their childhood. The leaders who replaced the Law and the Prophets with the Pauline epistles were mostly Gentiles from pagan backgrounds, who had comparatively little understanding of the Old Testament Scriptures (who previously were Gentiles in the flesh...being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world). We can read about these people in various documents from the Second Century.

One Church historian has this to say about these documents: "Many stories come in versions so distorted that it

is hard to decide whether the principal characters were worthy successors to the apostles, or the devil's own agents. Perhaps their contemporaries were as uncertain as we are." (Smith, M. A. From Christ to Constantine, London: Intervarsity Press, 1971, p.14).

There is one character, however, which was undoubtedly one of the greatest adversaries to maintaining the faith once given to the saints.... the heretic Marcion. Marcion lived in the second half of the Second Century and it was he who was the first to collect and alter the writings in existent at that time from the followers of Yeshua. Marcion taught that the entire Old Testament should be rejected because it belonged to an evil, inferior God, and not to the God revealed by Jesus of Nazareth. With such an attitude it is easy to understand why his "First New Testament" was an aberration of truth which in reality was founded upon anti-Semitism.

Marcion was very anti-Jewish; therefore he also rejected any New Testament writings which appeared to speak favorably of "Jewish practices" (i.e., keeping the laws and commandments of the Old Testament, keeping the Festivals and Holy Days of the LORD, keeping the Sabbath, etc.). As one writer notes, "Marcion started the trend which has had many followers right up to the present -- if it doesn't suit the theory excise it as spurious or an interpolation." (Smith, M. A. From Christ to Constantine, London: Intervarsity Press, 1971, p.53).

THE MAKING OF THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

By the time Marcion finished editing the existing writings from the Yeshua's followers, Marcion's "Bible", or should I say New Testament, consisted of nothing more than Luke's Gospel (minus the "Jewish" elements...including the infancy narratives) and ten of Paul's epistles (many of which were added to and altered by the Monks until the completion of the Canon). That is all that was there. What is important for you to realize is that Marcion's "skeleton" would be adopted, added to, and deletions made by Irenaeus in 180 C.E. Now we have the New Testament which will become the foundation for the Catholic Church in years to come.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that the infancy narratives, especially Luke chapter 1-3 were not in there?

Answer for yourself: Were you also aware that Romans chapter 9, 10, and 11 were not in Marcion's First New Testament?

Answer for yourself: Do you realize that for one who was opposed to Law and partial to grace, and who would have loved to use for his polemic against the Jews such a passage as Romans 10:9-10 (9. That if you shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. 10. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation.) could not because it was not written yet nor was it available to be included in his canon?

Answer for yourself: As a Christian don't you find that more than problematic considering it did not exist in 140 C.E. but was added by others before 180 C.E. when we now find it in the Romans collected by Irenaeus?

Paul, Marcion taught, was the only apostle who could be trusted. In reality I found it to be just the opposite after 15 years of in-depth Biblical research.

Marcion's anti-Jewish, pro-Paul churches spread throughout the Roman Empire and soon became a major threat to the Messianic faith. According to historians, Marcion's heresy continued to spread until it finally died out sometime around the Fifth Century.

Answer for yourself: We who claim to believe the Bible must ask ourselves an important question: Did Marcion's anti-Jewish, anti-Old Testament, pro-Paul heresy really die out?

Answer for yourself: Or did the Church simply succumb to it and accommodate it and incorporate it, in a subdued form, into Mainstream Christianity?

MARCION'S INFLUENCE TODAY IN CHRISTIANITY THROUGH HIS COLLECTION OF WRITINGS ...THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

Answer for yourself: Of course our Bible, unlike Marcion's, includes the Law and the Prophets, but how much do we heed their instruction?

Answer for yourself: When was the last time your church preached out of the Old Testament?

Answer for yourself: How many classes in your church's educational program is devoted to the Old Testament?

Answer for yourself: When you read the Bible for yourself do you find that you read the New Testament more than the Old Testament?

When we examine the average Christian's attitude to the Law and the Prophets, it is obvious that the influence of Marcion is very much alive in the church today and actually determines what is being taught and what is not being taught.

Although the Church pays lip service to the inspiration and authority of all the Scriptures, the Church's de-emphasis of the Law, the Prophets, and anything "Jewish," and its heavy emphasis on Paul to the exclusion of other sections of the Bible, reveals that the Christian Church today is basically Marcionite in practice and that the influence of Marcion is alive in the churches of today. For those who doubt this assertion, let us examine some things that Marcion taught, and we will see that the influence of Marcion still has a very strong influence on the Church today.

MARCION'S THEOLOGY IS TO BE FOUND IN THE WRITINGS HE PUT TOGETHER AND ALTERED...THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

Marcion's most influential writing was a work entitled Antithesis, described as "a highly competent work" which consisted of "contrasted statements arranged to prove the incompatibility of the law and the gospel." (Tertullian, Against Marcion, trans. and ed. Ernest Evans, Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972, p.xv). Please notice that other Gentile church fathers even were aware of Marcion's intent to contrast Law vs. Gospel, or more appropriately understood, contrast the Old Testament vs. the New Testament. Sadly this idea is prevalent in most churches today.

Unfortunately (or perhaps fortunately), there are no known copies of Antithesis in existence. What we know about Marcion's teachings comes mainly from the writings of those who opposed his heresy. The one to write the most about Marcion was Tertullian, a church leader who wrote a lengthy work called Against Marcion. Tertullian describes Antithesis as "a work strained into making such a division between the Law and the Gospel as thereby to make two separate gods, opposite to each other, one belonging to one instrument (or, as it is more usual to say, testament), one to the other, and thus lends its patronage to faith in another gospel, that according to Antithesis." (Tertullian, IV.1)

No real Christian today would admit to believing in two gods, of course. Yet many believers make such a division between Old Testament Law and New Testament grace; they view the Law as something opposed to grace (its not). Because of the influence of Marcion the Law is seen as something obsolete and of little use to a Christian today. Such a warped view of God's Law will carry over into our view of God Himself. If God's Old Testament Law is opposed to God's New Testament grace, we end up with either a schizophrenic God, or Marcion's two gods.

"Marcion sets up unequal gods," Tertullian writes, "the one a judge, fierce and warlike, the other mild and peaceable, solely kind and supremely good." (Tertullian, IV.1.6)

Answer for yourself: Is this not exactly what many Christians do?

They shun the "Old Testament God" because He is too stern and fierce. They focus instead upon the "New Testament God," who, in their minds, does not expect obedience to His laws. Listen to Tertullian's description of Marcion's God, and see if it is not a description of the god presented by the Church today: Marcion's god "displays neither hostility nor wrath." He "neither condemns nor disdains" and "does not punish." "A better god has been discovered," Tertullian sarcastically writes, "one who is neither offended nor angry nor inflicts punishment...he is merely kind. Of course he forbids you to sin -- but only in writing. It lies with you whether you consent to accord him obedience." (Tertullian, IV.1.26f).

"To what purpose does he lay down commands?" Tertullian asks. "This god is exceptionally dull-witted if he is not offended by the doing of that which he dislikes to see being done." (Tertullian, IV.1.26f).

We should ask ourselves the same question about the God we worship.

Answer for yourself: To what purpose does God lay down commands which He never expected to be obeyed by his people?

We are certainly not justified by keeping the Law without faith. We are justified by faith first.

Answer for yourself: But after we are justified, what are we to do with God's commandments? Are we to put them into practice, or are we to ignore or disobey them?

One thing that has helped the influence of Marcion to thrive so well in the Twentieth Century Church is the popularity of the Scofield Reference Bible. Even Christians who have never seen a Scofield Bible have probably been affected by it indirectly, through preachers and teachers who have been influenced by it. The Scofield Bible contains many excellent study notes and aids to understanding the Scriptures. Several of Scofield's notes, however, strongly suggest a Marcionite view of Law and Grace. A reader of Scofield's notes is left with the impression that Law and Grace are mutually exclusive and are opposite forces that continually oppose each other. Scofield's anti-law bias has fed and nurtured and sustained the tares of nomophobia (fear of the law) that Marcion sowed in the Church nineteen centuries ago. As the end of the age approaches, God is sending forth His messengers to uproot these tares, so His wheat can mature and bring forth the fruit of obedience to God's laws.

Sadly a spirit of lawlessness (rejection of Law with a replacement of grace only) has been hanging over the Church for most of its history. Some Christians have been influenced by it more than others, of course. It may be hard for you to understand this, but Paul saw this same insidious thing beginning in his lifetime. Second Thessalonians speaks about "the secret power of lawlessness" which was "already at work" when Paul wrote to the Thessalonians. Paul told the Thessalonians that before the Messiah returned, there would be a "falling away" (apostasy, 'departure from truth'). Notice this was written about "religious people." This departure from "the truth" would then open the door for something called "the man of lawlessness" to come forth. This "coming of the lawless one" would be accompanied by "all kinds of counterfeit miracles, signs and wonders" which would "deceive those who are perishing."

"They perish because they refused to love the truth and so be saved," Paul writes. "For this reason God sends them a powerful delusion so that they will believe the lie." In preparation for the coming of the Messiah, God is also sending a powerful revelation to graciously expose the ancient lie, so that those who love the truth can depart from error and be freed from the bewitching influence of the spirit of lawlessness.

In 1989, Ted Turner of CNN declared the Ten Commandments obsolete, and offered his own "Ten Voluntary Initiatives" as an alternative to God's outdated laws. No one should take Turner seriously, of course, but he did make one comment that deserves our attention. "Nobody around likes to be commanded," he said.

"Commandments are out." (Turner's Commandments," Peoria Journal Star, 27 Oct., 1989, section D, p.22).

Answer for yourself: Christians may scoff at Turner's idea of replacing God's laws with human ideas, yet is this not the very thing the Church has done with some of God's commandments?

We have replaced the 24-hour, seventh-day Sabbath with an hour or two of Sunday morning worship; we have replaced the Biblical holy days with holidays of pagan origin; we have replaced God's dietary guidelines with our own ideas about what we should eat, and we have replaced giving the tithe to places ONLY where God has placed his name to the general fund of churches who use the LORD'S moneys in any way they desire. For your information the tithe in the Bible is to go to ONLY three categories or receptacles: 1) the widows, orphans, sick, lame blind, etc., 2) you are to keep part of your tithe to celebrate the LORD'S Festivals, Sabbaths, and help the poor to observe them with you, and 3) to the Levite or the "teacher" (not the preacher..for once you are taught, then it is you in the pew who are to preach to the world) who teaches the truth of God's Word and not the by-laws of your particular denomination.

Answer for yourself: Do you not realize that if your church does not distribute the LORD'S tithe accurately then you are a party to "robbing God" and you have placed yourself and your family "under a curse?"

Having said that you can now better understand the following question.

Answer for yourself: After a person has been forgiven and justified by faith, where should he look for moral instruction?

Answer for yourself: Should he look to God's commandments to tell him how to live the Christian life, or should he ignore God's commandments and live according to man's suggestions, denominational guidelines, or other's religious recommendations which often contradict Scripture?

Even Scofield, in spite of all his anti-law bias and nomophobia, concedes that the Old Testament commandments "are used in the distinctively Christian Scriptures as an instruction in righteousness." (The Scofield Reference Bible, ed. C. I. Scofield, New York: Oxford University Press, 1917, p.1245).

In Against Marcion, Tertullian accuses Marcion and his followers of "forbidding what [God] commands and commanding what he forbids." (Tertullian, IV.1). The influence of Marcion continues to do this very same thing in the Church today. Mainstream Christianity has criticized believers for keeping the seventh-day Sabbath, for celebrating the Biblical holy days like Passover instead of Easter, for practicing the dietary laws (which is taught by James for all Gentile believers in Jesus in Acts 15 as he quotes from the Laws of Noah for believing Gentiles), for placing one's tithe in other places than the local church (the storehouse which was to receive "all the tithe" is a food barn...none of the tithe was every allowed by God to be used for church building payments or administration), and for refusing to shave their beards...all things that God has commanded. And, like Marcion, Mainstream Christianity often commands what God forbids: "Forget the Sabbath. Ignore the holy days and dietary laws, bring your tithe to the storehouse for the church is "the storehouse" (which it is not!). And shave that beard, so you'll look like a Christian!" Many Bible colleges and seminaries command their students to shave the beard, in spite of God's command in Lev.19:27.

Marcion, like many church leaders today, misused the words of Jesus and the words of Paul to support this nomophobic, anti-Jewish, pro-Paul gospel. Tertullian rightly points out that Jesus' verbal attacks upon the teachers of the Law were not aimed at the Law itself but man's perversion and misuse of God's Law. "He is not criticizing the burdens of the law," Tertullian writes. The burdens Jesus criticized were, according to Tertullian, "those which they piled on of their own, teaching for precepts the doctrines of men." (Ibid., IV.27). You only have to review the previous paragraph to reacquaint yourself with several examples where by religious men have substituted church programs, denominational structures, and the commandments of well-intentioned religious men for the commandments of God.

Tertullian shows the importance Jesus attached to keeping the commandments when he writes about the rich young ruler who approached Jesus: "So when he is asked by that certain man, 'Good Teacher, what shall I do

to obtain possession of eternal life?', he inquired whether he knew --which means, was keeping -- the Creator's commandments. Come now, Marcion, and all you dear brethren who find yourself immersed in the offensiveness of that heretic, will you be bold enough to say **"Did Christ here abolish those former commands...?" No way!**

Tertullian opposes Marcion's misuse of Paul's writings by pointing out the "Jewishness" of Paul's faith, and then asking, "What had (Paul) still to do with Jewish custom, if he was the destroyer of Judaism?" (Ibid., V.5).

He also refers to Romans 7:7 to combat Marcion's hatred of the Law: "What shall we say then? That the law is sin? God forbid." Shame on you, Marcion. When Paul states "God forbid" the apostle expresses abhorrence of those who were complaining against the law...Yet he adds even more: "The law is holy, and its commandment is just, and good." (Ibid., V.14). As Tertullian points out later, "you cannot make a promoter of the law into an opponent of it." (Ibid., V.17). This correct view by this Gentile teacher has, for the most part, being completely overlooked and replaced by a faith that rejects the Law that Jesus accepted.

Unfortunately, the organized Church, not only would ignore men like Tertullian and other, but they also ignored Paul's positive statements about the Law and Jesus' warning about the necessity of continuing to practice and teach the Old Testament commandments. (See Matt.5:17-19.)

MARCION'S CANON INFLUENCED THE THEOLOGY OF THOSE WHO WOULD WRITE ABOUT THE FAITH LATER

The Epistle of Barnabas, an influential letter written in the Second Century, indicates the general direction the Gentile Church was heading in its attitude to the Old Testament. "The main theme of Barnabas", writes one church historian, "is a spiritualization of the Mosaic law." The writer holds that the were "wrong to take the Old Testament literally." (Smith, M. A. From Christ to Constantine, Intervarsity Press, 1971, p.39). Everything in the Old Testament was allegorized to give it a Christian meaning, thus destroying the literal meaning which tells us what to do and what not to do. Even the commandments were taken figuratively, because, according to Barnabas, "the law of Moses had never been meant to be taken literally." (Eerdman's Handbook To The History Of Christianity, ed. Tim Dowley, Grand Rapids: Wm. B. Eerdmans, 1977, p.102). I find it rather difficult for a Jew who grew up loving the Torah to ever express such a diabolical view of the Law of God that all Jews grew up loving. To the Gentiles the dietary restrictions were said to represent not actual food, but various kinds of sinful habits. What well meaning Gentiles fail to understand is that in Rabbinic interpretation one always begins with the "Peshat" method of interpretation which is ALWAYS the plain, ordinary and simple meaning of the verse...which is always understood in a literal understanding. So to discount the first level of Scripture interpretation is quite surprising to those who know the methods of Hebraic Scriptural Hermeneutic.

Remembering that Marcion's New Testament existed before Justin, then it is not hard to understand that Justin Martyr's Dialogue With Trypho The Jew also shows early Christianity's negative attitude toward the Law. Trypho the Jew expresses bewilderment when he tells Justin, "[You Christians] spurn the commands...and then try to convince us [Torah-observant Jews] that you know God, when you fail to do those things that every God-fearing person would do. If, therefore, you can give a satisfactory reply to these charges and can show us on what you place your hopes, even though you refuse to obey the Law, we will listen to you most willingly, and then we can go on and do in the same manner our other differences." (Justin Martyr, Dialogue With Trypho, ch.10. Ibid., ch.11, 14. 20Ibid., ch.47).

Justin replies by saying that the Law is "abrogated," "voided," and tells Trypho, "You understand all in a carnal way." (Ibid., ch. 11, 14).

BUT NOT EVERYONE WAS DECEIVED BY MARCION'S FIRST NEW TESTAMENT AND HIS ANTI-JEWISH THEOLOGY

Not all followers of the Messiah were influenced by the nomophobic, anti-Old Testament, pro-Paul gospel of Marcion. There is historical evidence of several groups of believers who practiced the Law as an expression of their faith God along with their belief in Yeshua as the Messiah.

After Trypho asks Justin about the possibility of believing in Yeshua as the Messiah and continuing to observe the commandments, Justin writes his reply: "Yes, Trypho, I conceded, there are some Christians who...desire to observe as many of the Mosaic precepts as possible...precepts which we think were instituted because of your hardness of heart...while at the same time they place their hope in Christ..." (Ibid., ch. 47).

Answer for yourself: Dear Child of God....did you hear history speak to you through Justin and his anti-Semitism and anti-Judaic theology?

Well into the second century the Gentile Christians (believers in the God of Israel as well as believers in the Jewish Messiah) kept the Law and the testimony of Jesus (see Rev.12:17 & 14:12)! Justin, previously a pagan philosopher who was in times past a stranger to the covenant promises, alien to the commonwealth of Israel, without hope and without God and who grew up knowing no restraints to his flesh, obviously disagreed with these Law-keeping Messianic believers, but he does acknowledge their existence. Notice that the Messianic community had not discarded the Law but continued to teach all nations to observe those things commanded by Jesus! Some would obey and others, like Justin, would find excuses not to submit to the rule of God over their lives in many areas...today we call this "Salad Bar Christianity." The uninformed Christian usually "picks" and "chooses" what he will obey and what he will not submit to.

The best-known of these groups who believed in Yeshua and practiced the Torah were the Nazarenes and the Ebionites. There were other groups, more obscure and far less orthodox, such as the Elchasaites and the Pseudoclementines. (Austin, Bill R. Austin's Topical History of Christianity, Wheaton, IL: Tyndale House, 1983, p.72f).

Some doctrinal errors in some of these groups probably contributed to the decision of the Mainstream Gentile Church to adopt Marcion's anti-law, anti-Jewish attitude. One writer notes that "Jewish Christianity in various forms continued as a disturbing factor until almost the Fifth Century. (Ibid., p. 73).

It is interesting that this is the same time that Marcion's heresy supposedly "died out." Once Marcion's error (in a modified, subdued form) had been fully assimilated into the Mainstream Church, "Jewish Christianity" was no longer a "disturbing factor" because the Law-keeping Christians were greatly outnumbered by those who had adopted Marcion's attitude toward the Law. The number of those who upheld both the Torah and the Messiah (see Rev.12:17 & 14:12) was so insignificant by the Fifth Century that the Mainstream Church no longer considered them a threat. But let us never forget that in obedience to the Great Commission the Jewish disciples of Jesus went into all the world (to the Gentiles) and taught them to observe those things that Yeshua taught. This is the true Great Commission.

The Good news I share with you is that "the remnant" who observed the original faith of Jesus and adhered to the faith once given to the saints exists today! For many they could now be written off as a fringe group, and conveniently ignored. Though they were few in number compared to the now-Marcionized Mainstream Church, these groups who upheld both the Torah and the Messiah continued to exist until at least as late as the Tenth Century (1000 years). (Flusser, David Jewish Sources in Early Christianity, New York: Adama Books, 1987, p.88).

While Mainstream Christianity, influenced by Marcion, de-emphasized the Law and over-emphasized Paul, groups such as the Ebionites totally rejected Paul, viewing him as an apostate and enemy of the Law.

The solution is not to reject either Paul or the Law; the solution is to view Paul's writings in a way that will allow them to harmonize with what the rest of the Bible says about the Law.

Answer for yourself: How should a disciple of Yeshua view Paul's epistles?

WHAT WE MUST REMEMBER BEFORE READING MARCION'S NEW TESTAMENT...THE LEGACY OF WHAT WE CARRY TODAY IN OUR BIBLES

If you have been faithful to study our web site up to this point, then you realize that the canon of the New Testament was not recognized until 380 C.E. and the very first collection of such writing was by Marcion in 140 C.E. A lot of changes, additions and deletions occurred during this 240 year period. Much would be changed after that as well. Understand that Marcion's anti-Jewish theology was incorporated among the pages of documents which others would build upon later in the canonization of the New Testament. Of course changes, additions, and deletions were made over the years, especially in light of the successive Catholic Church Councils. This is hard fact. But what we must realize is that when we read these documents called the New Testament today that among the writing we have both passages reflecting what Yeshua both believed and practiced as well as what he opposed. Telling the difference is the hard part. But without such an awareness one is gullible to accept everything written in the New Testament without question. Such is not only unwise but foolish.

SO HOW AM I TO READ THE NEW TESTAMENT AND TELL TRUTH FROM ERROR?

To complete answer that question the whole of this web site is dedicated. But at least let us start with some basic principles for reading the New Testament accurately in search for truth. For those who desire to be faithful and to live "by every word that proceeds from the mouth of God," seven guidelines are listed below. The Bible student should keep these guidelines in mind when reading Paul's writings in order to arrive at a correct Biblical understanding.

PRINCIPLE 1: LOOK AT THE OVER-ALL BIBLICAL CONTEXT

Paul's epistles, like any other part of Scripture, must be viewed in the light of the entire Bible. This means that when we are dealing with the Law, we must not focus in on a few statements Paul made, and ignore everything else the Bible says about God's Law. As pointed out earlier, Paul's writings make up approximately 5% of the Bible. Paul's writings must be understood in a way that will make them compatible with what the other 95% of the Bible says. In other words, let the other 95% of the Bible interpret the 5% that Paul wrote.

It is important to remember that for many years, the Old Testament was the only Bible the Early Church had. The New Testament writings were gradually accepted into the canon of the Scriptures over four hundred years. It was not until about the middle of the Second Century that the term "the Scriptures" was ever used in referring to the New Testament. (Smith, p.63). Therefore, when New Testament writers mention "the Scriptures" or the commandments," they are referring to the Old Testament!

PRINCIPLE 2: HISTORICAL CONTEXT

The New Jerusalem Bible, in its Introduction to Paul, makes this statement: "It is important to remember that Paul's letters were not meant as theological treatises: most of them represent his response to a particular situation in a particular church....Paul's letters do not give any systematic and exhaustive exposition of his teaching; they presuppose the oral teaching which preceded them, and enlarge and comment only upon certain

points of that. (The New Jerusalem Bible, ed. Henry Wansbrough, New York: Doubleday and Co., 1985, p.1852f).

Because Paul often wrote to correct particular problems in particular churches, we must have some knowledge of the situation Paul was addressing if we are to understand his writings. Sometimes the problem can be inferred from Paul's remarks, but often we are left with little or no knowledge of the situations Paul was dealing with. In reality, except for the epistle of Ephesians which was intended to be passed around among various churches, the vast majority of Paul's letters were "private mail" from one party to another. It is not out of question to even consider that we are "reading another's mail" which was never intended for us since we do not find ourselves with such unique problems that prompted the letters.

Answer for yourself: Surely we are not guilty of tampering with the mail are we?

Theologians often try to reconstruct the historical backgrounds of the epistles, and make educated guesses about the problems Paul was addressing. This can be a noble effort, if it is done in a sincere attempt to come to a clearer understanding of what Paul taught. Unfortunately, many people come to an understanding of Paul that contradicts what the rest of the Bible teaches, either by incorrectly reconstructing the historical background, or by ignoring it altogether.

PRINCIPLE 3: PETER'S WARNING

It is important to bear in mind Peter's warning that Paul's letters are not easy to understand: "His letters contain some things that are hard to understand, which ignorant and unstable people distort, as they do the other Scriptures, to their own destruction." Therefore, dear friends, since you already know this, be on your guard so that you may not be carried away by the error of lawless men and fall from your secure position (2 Pet. 3:16f).

Those with little or no knowledge of the Old Testament Scriptures are especially apt to misinterpret Paul's writings to their own ruin. Notice, it is not the Law-keeping disciples of Yeshua who distort Paul's epistles -- it is "lawless men" that Peter warns us about.

PRINCIPLE 4: YESHUA'S WARNING

Early in His ministry, Yeshua spoke this warning to his followers: "Do not think that I have come to abolish the Law or the Prophets; I have not come to abolish them but to fulfill them. I tell you the truth, until heaven and earth disappear, not the smallest letter, not the least stroke of a pen, will by any means disappear from the Law until everything is accomplished. Anyone who breaks one of the least of these commandments and teaches others to do the same will be called least in the kingdom of heaven, but whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt.5:17-19).

Yeshua's warning seems plain and simple enough to understand, yet many Christians mistakenly believe that by fulfilling the Law, he thereby abolished it. **This is exactly what he is warning us not to think!** "I have come to fulfill the Law," he says, "but do not even think that by fulfilling it, I am thereby abolishing it."

Sometimes it is easier for people outside Mainstream Christianity to see the blindness of Christians in this area. The Jewish Encyclopedia quotes Jesus' warning of Matt.5:17, and then makes this bold statement: "The rejection of the Law by Christianity, therefore, was a departure from its Christ." (The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer New York and London: Funk and Wagnalls, 1903, Vol.V., p.52).

In an article with the catchy title, "Jesus Was Not a Christian," the writer points out that "Jesus certainly wouldn't have been recognized as a Christian throughout his entire life." He "scrupulously adhered to the law of Moses" and "enjoined his disciples to keep every detail of the Torah." (John Murray Smoot, Jesus Was Not a Christian, A Way in the Wilderness, ed. M. G. Einspruch, Baltimore: The Lederer Foundation, 1981, p.28).

A story in the New York Yiddish Forward tells of a reporter's encounter with an old Hasidic Jew in Paris years ago. This Jew had a fervent faith in Jesus as the Messiah. When the reporter asked him about the compatibility of Orthodox Judaism and belief in Jesus, the old man replied, "Who then should believe in him -- the gentiles?" The reporter describes the old man's remarks this way: "He said that only Jews can truly accept belief in Jesus as the Messiah and regard him as the last prophet, for gentiles can never accept such a lofty faith. It is next to impossible for them to walk in his ways, for first of all, Yeshua, as he called him, commanded to observe all the Jewish laws, the entire Torah, and gentiles do not even know this." (J. Feldman, "Yozel's Hasid," The Ox, the Ass, the Oyster, ed. Henry and Marie Einspruch, Baltimore: The Lederer Foundation, 1975, p.74.

Of course it is not impossible for Gentiles to accept and practice such a lofty faith.

Answer for yourself: The question is, will they do it? Or will they continue to cling to the lies of Marcion? How about you?

PRINCIPLE 5: PAUL'S POSITIVE STATEMENTS ABOUT THE LAW

Many Christians overlook or choose to ignore the positive things Paul said about the Law. He writes, for example, "the law is holy, and the commandment is holy, righteous and good" (Rom.7:12). Paul says, "For in my inner being I delight in God's law" and "I myself in my mind am a slave to God's law" (Rom.7:22,25).

He tells Timothy, "We know that the law is good if one uses it properly" (1 Tim.1:8). To the Corinthians he writes, "Keeping God's commandments is what counts" (1 Cor.7:19). Even when explaining the righteousness that comes by faith, Paul is careful to make sure his readers know that their faith does not give them an excuse to ignore God's Law: "Do we, then, nullify the law by this faith? Not at all! Rather, we uphold the law" (Rom.3:31).

PRINCIPLE 6: PAUL'S NEGATIVE STATEMENTS ABOUT THE LAW

Paul, in his negative statements about the Law, was not criticizing the Law itself, but man's misuse of the Law.

The Law was meant to be a moral guide for a people already justified by faith, but some people in Paul's day were depending on their Law-keeping as the means of their justification before God. What Paul criticized was not Law-keeping itself, but making Law-keeping the basis of one's justification before God.

Between the Babylonian Captivity and the time of the Messiah, Israel developed an erroneous understanding of the Law's purpose. The Jews who first returned from Babylon knew that their exile had been the result of the breaking of God's laws; therefore, they put a heavy emphasis on the Law when they returned to their homeland. Unfortunately, this new emphasis eventually developed a theology that caused some people to erroneously view Law-keeping, rather than faith, as the key to their justification. Paul's negative statements about the Law were simply his attempts to correct this erroneous use of the Law.

One writer puts it this way: "Paul, in his epistles, affirms the law, yet condemns the wrong emphasis men place upon it. In this sense he is turning believers back to the original intent of the law, it being a rule for godly living for those who are already redeemed. He rejects the later shift towards making it a means of salvation." (Michael Schiffman, A Pauline Understanding of the Place of the Law for New Covenant Believers," The Messianic Outreach, 7:3, Spring 1988, p.9).

Another author says basically the same thing when he writes, "Paul rejects the law as a method of salvation but upholds it as a standard for Christian conduct." (Bacchiocchi, Samuele The Sabbath in the New Testament, Berrien Springs, MI: University Printers, 1985, p.101).

If we ignore this fact, we will twist the writings of Paul to our own loss, as Marcion and other lawless men have done throughout the centuries.

PRINCIPLE 7: PAUL'S EXAMPLE

Actions speak louder than words, the well-known proverb says. If we truly want to understand Paul's attitude towards the Law, we must look at his actions as well as his words.

Even in Paul's own lifetime, false rumors were circulating that Paul taught people "to forsake Moses, telling them not to circumcise their children nor to walk according to the customs" (Acts 21:21). To dispel these false accusations, the elders of Jerusalem had Paul go with four men who had taken a vow (a Nazarite vow), telling Paul that in this way "all will know that there is nothing to the things which they have been told about you, but that you yourself also walk orderly, keeping the Law" (Acts 21:24).

To his Jewish accusers from Jerusalem, Paul said, "I have committed no offense either against the Law of the Jews or against the temple" (Acts 25:8). To the Jews in Rome, he repeated this same testimony: "Brethren, though I had done nothing against our people, or the customs of our fathers, yet I was delivered prisoner into the hands of the Romans" (Acts 28:17).

Paul's Law-Keeping included worshipping on the Sabbath (Acts 13:14; 14:1; 16:13;17:1f,10; 18:4,19), celebrating the Biblical holy days (Acts 20:6,16), and taking a Nazarite vow (Acts 18:18) in which he was to bring blood sacrifices and sin offerings after the cross of Yeshua no less (Num. 6). Paul did not do away with the Law as you have been told.

It is very clear that Paul continued to keep the Law after he met Yeshua whom he believed to be the Messiah. The only thing that changed was Paul's reason for keeping the Law. Before, he had kept it in an effort to be justified before God. After meeting Yeshua, he found the justification he had sought through his Law-keeping. Paul was justified through faith, and the Law was internalized, "written upon the heart," as Jeremiah prophesied it would be (31:31-34). Now he desired to obey God's commandments because of the inward impulse of his new nature. His obedience was no longer the result of an external compulsion to justify himself before God by Law-keeping. Thus, he was free to obey "in the way of the Spirit, and not in the old way of the written code" (Rom.7:6).

By keeping the Law, in the right way and for the right reasons, Paul left an example for all disciples to follow, Jew or non-Jew. Some people seem to think that only Jewish believers were expected to continue practicing Torah. The so-called "Great Commission" rules out this possibility. When Jesus instructed His Jewish disciples to go to "all nations [Gentiles]," he told them to teach the Gentile nations "to obey ever thing I have commanded you [My Jewish disciples]" (Matt.28:18ff). He commanded his Jewish disciples to obey the Torah (Matt.5:17-19 & 23:1-3), and they were to teach the Gentiles to do it.

The key to godly living is not to ignore the Law and elevate Paul, as Marcion did. Nor is the solution to overemphasize the Law and reject Paul, as the Ebionites and others did. The solution is to do what Paul said to do: "Follow my example, as I follow the example of Messiah" (1 Cor.11:1). If we truly follow Paul's example, as he followed the example of Messiah, we will begin to practice the Old Testament commandments that the Church has ignored or changed.

A. W. Tozer wrote, "Probably no other portion of the Scriptures can compare with the Pauline epistles when it comes to making artificial saints. (Gems From Tozer, England: Send the Light Trust, 1969, p.18). Let us avoid artificial sainthood by keeping in mind the above-mentioned seven guidelines for understanding Paul's epistles: 1) over-all Biblical context, 2) historical context, 3) Peter's warning, 4) Jesus' warning, 5) Paul's positive statements about the Law, 6) Paul's negative statements about the Law, 7) Paul's example.

As we let the naked truth of Holy Scripture renew our minds and change our thinking, the sunlight of God's Word will dispel the mist of the ghost of Marcion. We will find ourselves transformed as the fog lifts, and as we

see the Law as God always meant it to be seen: as something positive, holy, and good, "if one uses it properly" (1 Tim.1:8).

Let those who wish to wholeheartedly follow the Messiah begin to learn the commandments, practice them, and teach them to others, for "whoever practices and teaches these commands will be called great in the kingdom of heaven" (Matt.5:19). As we banish the legacy and influence of Marcion, the "spirit of lawlessness" from our theology, we will see the commandments not as a yoke of bondage, but as a moral guide by which we can joyfully live a life that is pleasing to the Heavenly Father. Then we will be able to rejoice in God's commandments as the psalmist did: "I will praise You with an upright heart as I learn your righteous laws...I rejoice in following Your statutes as one rejoices in great riches...I have chosen the way of truth; I have set my heart on Your laws. I hold fast to Your statutes, O Lord; do not let me be put to shame. I run in the path of Your commands, for You have set my heart free...I will always obey Your law, forever and ever. I will walk about in freedom, for I have sought out Your precepts...Great peace have they who love Your law, and nothing can make them stumble" (Ps.119:7,14,30-32,44f,165).

Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



MARCION AND HIS FIRST NEW TESTAMENT...IS IT INSPIRED AND INERRANT?

Marcion is the first person known to us who published a fixed collection of what we would call New Testament books. Others may have done so before him; if so, we have no knowledge of them. He rejected the Old Testament totally, as having no relevance or authority for Christians; his collection of documents was therefore designed to be the first New Testament. I wonder what Yeshua thought of his endeavors since Marcion threw out the Bible Yeshua (Yeshua) used. It is amazing that before Marcion (over 140 years) we find no evidence of the "church" using or even having a need for any writings other than the Jewish Bible of Yeshua. Just consider this one fact for a minute.

Answer for yourself: What implications does this have for you as a believer who attends contemporary churches where the Old Testament is rarely used?

GETTING FAMILIAR WITH MARCION....WHAT YOU NEED TO KNOW

Marcion was born about 100 C.E. at Sinope, a seaport on the Black Sea coast of Asia Minor. His father was a leader in the synagogue of that city, and Marcion was brought up in the Apostolic Faith. Of all the apostles, the one who appealed to him most strongly was Paul, to whom he became passionately devoted, ultimately concluding that he was the **ONLY** apostle who preserved the teaching of Yeshua in its purity. This strikes me as almost unbelievable. Paul never met Yeshua or heard him preach or teach one lesson. Paul's only encounter with Yeshua was a vision; it is for that reason I find it hard to imagine that Marcion would discount the lives and testimonies of those who not only knew Yeshua personally, but lived and ministered along his side for three and one-half years. It is hard for any unbiased person to believe that Paul's understanding was greater than James for example; after all James was Yeshua's brother who lived with him over thirty years and was Yeshua's choice to lead the Messianic Congregation after his ascension (and not Paul).

Marcion embraced with great zeal the teachings of Paul, especially his gospel of justification by divine grace, apart from legal works. This view is an incorrect assessment as I have shown in previous newsletters regarding the role of the Law with grace. Marcion has been called "the only man in the early church who understood Paul," however it would be later said of him also that "even in his understanding he misunderstood him." Marcion's refusal to allow any element of law-keeping (obedience) be connected to Paul's understanding of the message of salvation (which is connected with faith) **led Marcion to the tragic and incorrect conclusion that the Old Testament, its laws and statutes had been superseded by the gospel.** There is only one problem: the Bible in the New Testament never says that (often you have to consult the original languages to see the hidden truths and more correct understandings concerning this issue). **Due to inadequate renderings in the English we often arrive at conclusions which were never intended by the original writers.** The gospel, Marcion believed, was an "entirely new teaching brought to earth by Messiah". Marcion believed that the law and the prophets made no sort of preparation for the Gospel, and if some passages in Paul's correspondence suggested that they did, then those passages were reasoned by Marcion to be a kind of "judaizing" (reverting back to Hebraic customs and understandings) against whom Marcion believed Paul to

have preached against in Galatians and other letters. Marcion made one tragic mistake, he read the New Testament in Greek without reverting back to the Hebrew for comparisons in doctrines and teachings. Such a grave mistake is responsible today for over 1500 denominations that make a laughing stock of Eph 4:5 which holds up "one faith" as the ideal. That one faith once delivered to the saints was and still is Messianic Judaism.

Sources teach us that Marcion appears to have remained in communion with the "proto-Catholic Church" of his day so long as he lived in Asia Minor. There is some reasons to think that he shared his radical thoughts with leading churchmen of the region, such as Polycarp of Smyrna (disciple of the Apostle John) and Papias of Hierapolis, but found them unresponsive.

Desiring a more positive response for his radical teachings, he ventured to talk with the churchman of Rome where he made a handsome donation of money to the church (he was a ship owner and was quite well off). His understanding of the gospel and its implications was so self-evidently right to his own way of thinking that he could not believe that it would fail to be equally self-evident to any other unprejudiced mind. But the Roman churchmen were disturbed by his doctrine that they not only rejected it but even returned the money he had presented to the church! That would be a miracle if done in today's churches!

Not only did Marcion regard Paul as the only faithful apostle of Yeshua; he maintained that the original apostles had corrupted their Master's teaching with an admixture of legalism. Not only did he reject the Old Testament (the Jewish Bible Yeshua used); he distinguished the God of the Old Testament from the God of the New Testament. Now we have two Gods. This distinction of two deities, each with his independent existence speaks of the Gnostic influence on Marcion's thought. The God who created the material universe, the God of Israel, was (as Marcion held) different from the Father of whom Yeshua spoke. The Father of Yeshua was the good and merciful God of whom none had ever heard of before until Yeshua came to reveal him. Along the lines of Gnostic teachings, the God who made the material world was an inferior deity (inferior in status and morality) to the supreme God who was pure spirit. Now we have a "good God" and an "evil God". The Gnostic depreciation of the material order finds an echo in Marcion's refusal to believe that Yeshua entered human life by being "born of a woman" (Ga. 4:4). The result of such teaching is that one will look forward to the day that he can escape from the evil body and become pure spirit. Does this sound familiar (Rom. 8:24). Paul bought into this dualism in a big way.

We are fortunate that at this time the church of Rome was yet enlightened and unprejudiced, but that would change later. Still the church of Rome found Marcion's teachings unacceptable. So Marcion, despairing of being able to convince the catholic church anywhere of the truth of his message, withdrew from the catholic fellowship and established a church of his own. The church survived for several generations which is surprising since its membership was maintained solely through conversion. It could not keep its membership up by incorporating the children of existing members, for celibacy was obligatory on all its membership. At the same time, Marcion was a faithful enough Paulinist to allow no discrimination against female members of his church in matters of privilege or function because he agreed with Paul that there was "neither male nor female" (Gal. 3:28).

Marcion provided his followers with an his rendition of the First New Testament. Marcion's new scriptures included no part of the Old Testament (Jewish Bible) and were written in Greek. Please keep in mind that he did not call his collection "The New Testament". It would be another 100 years or so before anyone would come up with that idea. Yeshua had been gone over 110 years before Marcion decided to create his new scriptures. Just think about it! Christianity did not have a need for a "New Testament".

Answer for yourself: From what did the church teach during that 110 years since they did not have a New Testament?

**THE EARLY CHURCH USED THE SAME BIBLE YESHUA USED;
THE JEWISH BIBLE (OLD TESTAMENT ONLY)**

A number of questions should come to your mind at this time:

Answer for yourself: Why didn't the "church" see a need for a New Testament?

Answer for yourself: Why didn't Yeshua tell his disciples to copy his words & produce a replacement Bible?

Answer for yourself: Why didn't Yeshua apostles record Yeshua's words or their own?

Answer for yourself: Why were the writings of the Jewish Bible used as the only Scripture?

Answer for yourself: Why was Marcion so anti-Semitic?

Marcion created "new scriptures" for his followers. He referred to them by the titles he gave to the two component parts: The Gospel and The Apostle. To his own Bible he would later add a series of "Antitheses," which set out the incompatibility of law and gospel, of the Creator-Judge of the Old Testament and the merciful Father of the New Testament (who had nothing to do with either creation or judgment).

Answer for yourself: Do you not find it startling that the teaching that the Old Testament was replaced by a New Testament began with a man who also saw two Gods?

Stop and consider what I just said for a minute (Selah). Because Marcion saw "two Gods" he had need for only the revelation of the "good God" or the New Testament which served as a "replacement testament" to replace the Old Testament of the "Creator-Judge" God of the Old Testament.

Answer for yourself: Now, let me ask you do you believe in two Gods? How about three? Get the point?

The first idea of replacing "law" with "grace" came from one who denied the cardinal teaching of the Bible: "Hear O Israel, the Lord is God, the Lord is ONE!" So when people tell you that they are "not under the Law" I wonder if they do not believe in Jehovah, the God of the Old Testament, who gave the Law in the first place.

The holy Scriptures to which the "Antitheses" served as an introduction inevitably included no part of the Old Testament; they consisted only of an edition of the Greek New Testament. Marcion did not call it a "New Testament", so far as we know, he may not have given any one title to the edition as a whole. He referred to it, as stated above, by the titles which he gave to its two component parts: Gospel and Apostle. Our main source for information about Marcion's Bible is Tertullian's treatise Against Marcion, written over a half century later (190 A.D.), when Marcion had been dead for some decades. Tertullian's response to Marcion is often hostile yet his factual data appears to be reliable.

Marcion's Gospel was an edition of the Gospel of Luke. The selection of Luke is in speculation even today, but more than likely owing to his affinity to Paul, he choose the Gospel of Luke because he was associated with Paul. Marcion nowhere mentioned Luke's name in connection with it; it was presented simply as the gospel of Christ. Its text was purged of those elements which were inconsistent with Marcion's understanding of the truth and which therefore, on his principles, must have been "added" by judaizing scribes. For example the birth of John the Baptist was omitted because it implied a connection between Yeshua and something that went before Him (remember to create a new religion one must have Yeshua not rely on anything in the past, but rather teach everything as if it were new and different). Yeshua brought nothing new with his ministry. He did not create a new religion. He did not do away with Judaism and give Christianity as its replacement. Marcion, as well as numerous others, tried valiantly to cover over the fact that Yeshua brought us nothing new and surely did not come to create a new religion to replace Judaism. If we are forced to see Yeshua quoting other teachers that were his forefathers then it is easy to see that he did not

come to bring a new religion as we have incorrectly supposed.

In Marcion's gospel we find no reference the birth of Yeshua whom many feel was written later and added subsequent to original New Testament of Marcion. According to Marcion, Yeshua entered the world not by virgin birth but by a descent as supernatural as was his later ascension. Now pay attention. The material and doctrines that will be very important to the Roman Catholic Church as they will create a new religion later are not to be found among Marcion's Bible or his Gospel of Christ. This means that either the Roman Catholic Church added the accounts or Marcion deleted them from previously existing writings.

Answer for yourself: What were some of the passages not found in Marcion's Gospel which would later show up in the Roman Catholic version?

- The birth of John the Baptist
- The birth of Yeshua
- The immersion of Yeshua
- Yeshua's' genealogy of Luke 3:23-38
- The temptation narrative of Luke 4:1-13
- Yeshua preaching at Nazareth in Luke 4:16-30

Answer for yourself: It is possible that the text of Luke which Marcion used as the basis for his Gospel was not identical with the text that has come down to us? More than likely "yes".

It may have been an earlier edition, lacking the first two chapters. Some consider it a "Proto-Luke". But even if the text which lay before Marcion did lack the first two chapters, it began at the latest with Luke 3:1, "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar," and those are the words with which Marcion's Gospel began. But the material which follows immediately was unacceptable to him. The account of John the Baptist's ministry and his baptism of Yeshua implies some continuity between Yeshua and the old order. So does the genealogy of Luke 3:23-38, tracing Yeshua's ancestry back to Adam through David & Abraham. Thus it must be excluded! The temptation narrative (Luke 4:1-13) represents Yeshua quoting from Deuteronomy three times, as though it had authority in his eyes. This, for Marcion, was impossible. Surely Yeshua came to begin a new thing; a new Religion! Surely, as Marcion would have us believe, Yeshua did no longer consider Deuteronomy as a necessary Scripture. Marcion was wrong! Equally impossible for Marcion, was the idea that Yeshua, preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30), should have claimed that his ministry was the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. So, having begin his edition of the Gospel with Luke 3:1, Marcion went straight on to Luke 4:31 and continued: "Yeshua came down to Capernaum" as though he came down there and then from heaven, fully grown.

In place of "Thy Kingdom come" in his version of the Lord's Prayer (Luke 11:2), Marcion's Gospel had the interesting variation: "Let thy Holy Spirit come on us and cleanse us." He may have found this in the copy of Luke which served as the basis for his edition, or it may have been his own addition. If he added it himself, it is interesting that it would have found its way into the textual tradition of "orthodox" Christians for it is cited by the church father Gregory of Nyssa and Maqsimus of Turin, and is the reading on one or two Greek manuscripts of the gospels.

The "old is good" (Luke 5:39) is omitted because it might be taken to imply approval of the Old Testament order and the religion of Yeshua. Possibly Yeshua did not come to replace Judaism with Christianity! Marcion could not entertain such an idea. The reference to Yeshua's mother and brothers could not be retained in Luke 8:19 (For Marcion Yeshua could not belong to any human family). It had to go. There are other peculiarities of Marcion's Gospel which can be explained with equal ease. It is simple; Marcion believed Yeshua was come to bring a replacement faith to Israel and anything that would show otherwise must be stricken from the record! Most Protestant and Catholic churches of today have been so influenced by Marcion that they ascribe to his basic premises! Such a shame.

Marcion's "The Apostle" was an edition of ten letters of Paul. The three Pastoral Epistles (1 & 2 Timothy, Titus) were not included because he used his own Gospel for the basis of this "edition" and it did not contain them. The Chester Beatty codex (P46) of Paul's letters also does not include the same books. Also in Marcion "Apostle" the two letters to the Corinthians are combined as well as the letters to Thessalonica.

Now pay attention. The Marcionite order of Paul's letters is given below:

1. **Galatians**
2. **Corinthians**
3. **Romans**
4. **Thessalonians**
5. **Laodiceans (Ephesians)**
6. **Colossians**
7. **Philippians**
8. **Philemon**

Notice the order of these letters in the Roman Catholic Church's Bible:

1. **Romans**
2. **Corinthians**
3. **Galatians**
4. **Ephesians**
5. **Philippians**
6. **Colossians**
7. **Thessalonians**
8. **1 & 2 Timothy (not in Marcion's Bible)**
9. **Titus (not in Marcion's Bible)**
10. **Philemon.**

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that the book of Romans was placed first in the canon of the Roman Catholic Church?

Answer for yourself: Why did those who collected Marcion's documents change the order of his "New Testament" and place the book of Romans first following the gospels?

ROME HAS TO ESTABLISH AUTHORITY FOR THE CHANGING OF THE FAITH OF YESHUA

The Roman Church had to justify the shift in authority from Jerusalem to Rome and what better way to show it than let the book of Romans appear "first" as the first and trend-setting epistle in the New Testament. Also they added books which were not in Marcion's First New Testament.

Answer for yourself: Why? Or, did Marcion omit these books?

Answer for yourself: Who would benefit the most from the adding of these other books at 180 C.E.?

At the beginning of his Apostle Marcion placed the letter to the Galatians in first position. This was to dramatize the differences & opposites between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles. To Marcion the letter (Galatians) mounted a direct attack on the Jerusalem apostles, for it was at their instance (and rightly so), or at least by their agents, that attempts were being made to win Paul's Gentile converts in Galatia over to a judaistic form of Christianity. Marcion considered this heresy. God did not! The remaining letters of Marcion's canon were arranged in descending order of length, the two letters of Corinthians being reckoned together as one composite letter and the two letter to the Thessalonians being

treated in the same way.

Anything that appeared inconsistent with what he believed to be authentic Pauline teaching was regarded as corruption from an alien hand and was removed. The mention of Abraham as the prototype of all who are justified by faith (Gal. 3:6-9) could not be allowed to remain in his Canon because he could not allow to exist any connection between law and the gospel as in Gal. 3:15-25. Thus it most likely was removed from Romans chapter 4.

Now for the most startling information concerning Marcion. His edition of Romans lacked Romans 1:19-2:1; 3:21-4:25; and all of Romans 9-11 except Romans 10:1-4 and 11:33-36, not counting everything after Romans 14:23. The idea of establishing the law through faith (Rom. 3:31), the application of the story of Abraham in chapter 4, the grappling with the mystery of Israel's unbelief in chapters 9-11 (with their concentration of proof-texts from the Old Testament), were all incompatible with Paul's gospel as Marcion understood it. As for chapter 15, its opening section includes a general endorsement of the Christian value of the Old Testament scriptures (vv4) and a string of quotations designed to show that the Gentile mission was foreseen and validated by Old Testament writers (vv 8-12), while its closing paragraph (vv 25-33) bears witness to a concern on Paul's part for the church of Jerusalem which Marcion must found incredible, given his understanding of the relation between Paul and that church.

Now for a land mine! Notice conspicuously absent is Rom. 10:9-10 which states that "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Yeshua, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness: and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation".

Answer for yourself: Why would not Marcion have included such a "Pauline Dogma" since he was pro-Pauline himself?

The answer is simple. The text in question was not given as inspired by the Holy Spirit to the Apostles and is not part of the original Gospel of Yeshua. It was written and added after Marcion and was not part of the Gospel or included in any Gospel writing as late as 140 years after Yeshua.

Answer for yourself: Did you hear what I said?

Answer for yourself: Don't you think it is about time you began to study to see what kind of religion you practice; the religion according to the teachings of Yeshua or according to the teachings of men?

SALVATION CONSISTS OF BOTH OBEDIENCE TO THE LAW (TORAH/COMMANDMENTS); NOT JUST GRACE ALONE

Because of Marcion and men like him we have two competing Gospels today. To Marcion the "God who created all things" had nothing to do with the gospel; he was a different being from the God and Father of our Yeshua. In this we see Marcion's rejection of all the Old Testament (the Bible Yeshua used). To what extent Marcion's text differed from the one he had inherited and used for the basis of his gospel is not easily discerned. It would appear to have been copied substantially as before containing deletions of Jewish influence and authority, with very little actual additions by Marcion himself. Suffice to say he "dejudiazed" the Scriptures and destroyed the Hebrew roots of the early faith. What is problematic, as said before, is the absence in Marcion's Canon of many texts recognized as "Pauline" by today's scholars, but which would most assuredly would have been included by Marcion if they had existed in his day (Rom. 10: 9-10).

Answer for yourself: What does that say for our "quick altar prayers" by which we give false security to repentant sinners who "repeat after me" and who we never see again?

The failure to include many passages we accept today as "Bible" by our churches can only mean one thing: they did not exist 140 years after Yeshua! Thus, many additions to the "inspired and infallible" Word of God would be added by Roman Catholics who followed. Thus, they would counter Marcion with their "own Bible" to counteract his Bible. They would write their own authority (Catholic) into the Bible (rework Marcion's Bible) to replace the authority of Jerusalem with the authority of Rome. The authority of Jerusalem was written out of the New Testament and replaced with the authority of Rome. The Catholic Church replaced the Jewish Synagogue. The Pagan Holidays replaced the Lord's Holy Days. Sunday replaced the Sabbath. Tithing to an "organization" or a "building" replaced "righteous giving to the needy." The Temple tax to support the "organization" (Temple) was replaced by robbing the saints of God's provision to them as distributed in the "poor tithe". The Noachide Laws for Gentile acceptance into Israel was replaced with Church Dogma of Augustine and Constantine. Martin Luther would shortly follow. The Lord's Supper was replaced with "Sunday cups and crackers". The Passover was replaced with Easter (fornication festival). Need I go on, because it does not stop here!

IN SUMMARY

- Luke 1:1 thru 2:52 Does not contain the introduction or the story of Yeshua's birth.
- Luke 5:39 Does not contain the phrase "The old is better"...it was added later.
- Luke 8:19 Makes no reference to Yeshua's mother and brothers.
- Luke 11:2 Adds "Let thy Holy Spirit come on us & cleans us".
- Luke 19:9 Does not contain the phrase "because he is the son of Abraham.
- Rom. 1:19-2:1 Does not contain the reasons for and the results of Gentile guilt and sin.
- Rom. 3:21-4:25 Does not contain section on righteousness and acceptance by God of both Jew and Gentile based on faith and obedience.
- Rom. 9-11 All omitted except for 10:1-4 where we see an unbalanced picture of Christ ending all law and 11:33-36. We have a distorted view of Jew & Gentile in God's purpose.
- Everything after Rom. 14:23 is omitted.
- Omission of foundational faith text of Rom. 10:9-10.

Marcion's Bible is of great significance to every modern Christian, because the power and authority of the many different Christian religions and denominations (over 2000) have been created from the words of the New Testament and not from the Old Testament, which was originally the authority for the followers of Christ for over 200 years.

Answer for yourself: Now that you know this, do you ever wonder what was added in these Marcion and Catholic documents which comprise the New Testament which neither Yeshua or the earliest Jewish followers of Yeshua, those who knew him best, could not accept nor follow?

Continue your studies on this web site and you will find out... Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



DID YOU KNOW THAT THE NEW TESTAMENT IS FAR FROM INERRANT?

The documents contained in the Tanakh (Old Testament) are without noticeable variation in all the ancient manuscripts (and codices) we have. Compare to this the fact that in the so-called "New Testament" collection of writings it is not hard to find hundreds and hundreds of variations and mistakes. No two ancient New Testament documents are the same (and then most are only portions of the present Christian writings). The differences between the Jewish Bible and the Christian New Testament are not just the quality and intent of the (writers and) scribes, but the "theological" diversity is enormous! When I read how particular the Jewish sages and scribes were in the transmission of the Jewish texts I was astounded.

The writings of the Hebrew canon were seen as sacred early, and treated as such. Even though there were factions within the Yahwistic Faith, the scrolls were held above human agendas once the text was established. Men devoted their lives (the Masoretes, as example) to making sure that letter, and later, vowel-point, accent, and scribal notations were worthy of the sacred nature of the words. To say they were meticulous is an understatement.

Christianity/Paulinism has always been polemic and apologetic, and highly splintered. Each faction or even congregation has had an overt and covert agenda. The "Church" took over 500 years to decide what was "sacred", i.e., what writings it felt could totally repurpose (repurposing the Sacred Book of a people Roman and Byzantine Christians had attempted to destroy and victimize). Each Christian congregation, it seems, had a holy document to justify its religious preferences. Each document were local products. If copying occurred locally or elsewhere, conditions and quality of transmission were poor and undisciplined. Later errors and even opinions of the scribes became part of the Christian writings and found their way into the Greek text! This explains how a Jewish faith as described in a supposedly Jewish book, the New Testament, can be filled with doctrines no Jew believed as well as the volumes of anti-Semitism clothed in its passages. Unlike the Masorah notes of the Hebrew Bible written separated from the main text, Christian scribes often added their comments within their "sacred" texts.

Answer for yourself: Are inspiration and inerrancy schemes necessary devices to lock out questions concerning the questionable providence of Christianity and its writings?

Some churches were more powerful and influential with the Roman government, and the government stepped in to solidify the "Church". The rest is history of a gentile phenomenon unworthy of space. Allow me this sorted example, for comparison sake:

The "NT" is no where sacred as is the Jewish Old Testament. The books of the NT were written, collected, and canonized by men and committees, not magically "breathed" into scribes.

Answer for yourself: If no two individual ancient Greek manuscripts (from which later translations were made) of the more than 5400 containing portions of the NT are the same textually, then which one of these is the "inspired" text?

Even 1600 years later, the best Christian scholars cannot determine the original words of Yeshua. Yet Christians have warred against each other over the most ridiculous nuances of their eclectic assemblage of writings. The first to start the "New Testament" canon was a man named Marcion.

Answer for yourself: What was his agenda?

He collected the letters of Paul of Tarsus, understandably, to promote the belief that the god of the Jews was an evil, worldly, hateful deity with designs to rule the earth through laws. Iesous was the new god, subduing the Jewish god, and bringing in a spiritual age via a extremely lax holy spirit. (Sounds like dispensationalism!)

Answer for yourself: Are modern "critical" scholars the first to question the providence of the New Testament?

Not at all. The collecting and "canonization" of books included was a long process . As mentioned above, ancient "books" were not comparable to what we have today. Scrolls were long and heavy, codexes (which had sewn pages) were large and heavy, and both could only include a limited amount of information found in a few letters, gospels, or a prophet or two. This is why that you will find few ancient codexes containing all of what is today understood as a "New Testament." Until the printed book after the 1540s, and probably later than this, very few Christians ever saw a "New Testament."

WHY A CHRISTIAN CANON?

Answer for yourself: What is the Christian Canon of Scripture?

There is agreement among the churches that what they call the "Old Testament" (i.e., the Tanakh) is authoritative and to be used by Christians for questions of doctrine and faith. Catholics add apocryphal writings to their menu as deuterocanonicals. (The first King James bibles also included the Apocrypha.)

But the "church" does not agree on the NT canon or canonical writing of the Christian age. The Syrian Church does not include 2 Peter, 2 & 3 John, Jude, or Revelations. The Ethiopic Church includes books called Synodos, Clement, Book of the Covenant (with Testament of the Lord), and the Didascalia. Both churches are very ancient. And they have been using these writings canonically since the 300-400s CE. **The Catholic Church itself did not close the canon until 1545 (Council of Trent), in reaction to Martin Luther.**

Martin Luther could not accept all the books of the church canon as proper. He had a problem with James, Hebrews, Jude, and Revelations because they did not square with Paul of Tarsus in his mind. These he placed in an appendix to his translation of the Christian bible. And other reformers, the foundations of today's fundamentalist Protestantism, held the Christian canon under suspicion as they did all the other Catholic inventions. Most Protestant groups do not officially "close" their canon of scripture, and may still be adding to it (for example, the Book of Mormon by the Latter Day Saints).

Typical Christians (like typical members of any group) are ignorant of their history, and just stay in line. To make known any questions concerning the divine status of their church attacks their security in their way of life. Inerrancy and inspiration issues really have little to do with the text of the NT. The doctrines of Inerrancy and Inspiration are designed to place the historical development, culture, and conclusions of Christianity beyond the questions concerning its biblical legitimacy.

Answer for yourself: Is the NT worthless?

The NT writings and most ancient writings are hardly worthless. Something important happened concerning Yeshua ben Yosef and an actual movement started because of him. Even though historical Christianity is better called Paulinism, and is not a result of intimate understanding of Yahwism, **there are clues of what Yeshua said and taught in several NT books. But using the correct criteria of biblical authority and interpretation allows one to be independent of this, and able to analyze uninspired, yet valuable**

did you know that the new testament is far from inerrant and infallible?

contributions buried in the NT.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



HOW DID WE GET SO FAR OFF TRACK YET WE HAD A BIBLE?

In the Jewish and Christian communities, our Bibles play very important roles. In both communities we hold and believe that the Bibles we have today are based on revelation from God and thereby are "inspired" from God. In both the Jewish and Christian communities we find that they teach that their doctrines are based on "the" Bible. Let us investigate and see if the claim of infallibility and inspiration can truly be applied to the Bible we have today after we come to the facts of how the Bible has been handed down to us today.

This becomes somewhat more confusing as we recognize that there are two basic camps in the Christian community: Catholic and Protestant. It goes without saying that the Bibles of these two communities differ in the number of books that they contain. When we include the Jewish community in this equation we soon arrive at the grand total of "three" Bibles. This presents us with our first question: "Which Bible is 'the' Bible?" I am sure that if a Jew, a Catholic, and a Protestant was asked that question the expected response would be "MINE!"

The Bibles of the Jewish , Catholic, and Protestant communities contain certain books which fall into three basic categories:

- **TANAKH-the Christian Old Testament.**
- **NEW TESTAMENT**
- **APOCRYPHA**

Below I have given you a breakdown of the three basic Bibles:

- **Jewish Bible-Tanakh**
- **Catholic Bible-Tanakh, New Testament, Apocrypha**
- **Protestant Bible-Tanakh, New Testament**

Notice, that all three faiths (Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant) are all in agreement that the Tanakh (Christian Old Testament) is an inspired document, but that is where the agreement stops. Notice also that the Catholic and Protestant communities are in agreement that the New Testament is "inspired", but not the Jewish community. But only the Catholic community considers the Apocrypha in the same category as the Tanakh and the New Testament.

WHAT YOU SHOULD ASK YOURSELF?

- **When did each of these Bibles comes into existence?**
- **Who decided which books would be included or excluded from each Bible?**
- **Why Were certain books added?**
- **Why were certain books excluded yet included in other Bibles?**

Since each Bible is directly linked to a community, our first question must begin with the origin of each of the communities in question.

Answer for yourself: When did each of these communities originate?

The Jewish community originated with Abraham who lived in the time period of approximately 1700 B.C.E. (B.C.). The Catholic community began around 400 C.E. (A.D.). The Protestant community originated with Martin Luther who was born November 10, 1483 and died February 18, 1546 C.E. Let us also understand that the origin of the community is not synonymous with the origin of their Bible (canon).

The development of the canon proved to be a revolutionary step in the history of religion. This concept is distinctive and characteristically Jewish. Regardless of what you have seen in the way of bumper stickers of late, the **Jew's "canon" caused other nations to call the people of Israel "the People of the Book."** The Jewish concept of "canonization" was to be largely adopted by Christianity and later Islam.

Canon is the Greek word that originally meant "a straight rod." Later it was used to mean a "carpenter's measuring rod." Finally it became a figurative term for "a standard by which other things could be measured." As applied to Biblical canonization, it designated "the closed nature of a body of sacred literature which had been accepted as 'authoritative'." This is because it has come to be understood in our day that a "canon" is "divinely revealed" to the community, regardless of whether it was or it wasn't!

HOW DID WE DEVELOP A NEW TESTAMENT CANON?

Although the process of assigning authority to a select group of books and thus creating a "canon" originated with the Jewish nation, the word "canon" and the word "bible" originated within the Greek language. Most reputable scholars agree that there was no canon of the Hebrew Scriptures (Tanakh) until the end of the 1st century C.E. (A.D.). Prior to that time there were a number of pieces of Hebrew literature with varying degrees of authority. The authority of this material, as well as the material itself, depended on the particular sect or community within Judaism.

Tribal traditions, collections of community laws, cultic and ritual laws, songs and hymns, oracles from priestly circles, utterances of the prophets, sayings attributed to wise sages, and chronicles of court events were gathered together and preserved. Not all of the materials recorded were related to the religious practices of the community, although much of it did concern their religious life. As national life stabilized and the **"RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEM"** of the community developed, literary material of this kind was used in the religious rituals and woven into historical narratives telling the story of the community of Yahweh's people. Gradually, and most unconsciously, there emerged out of this body of literature certain writings which the community recognized as speaking with unique authority for their religious life. As such it was given a special designation and treated with a reverence not accorded to other writings in use among them.

In Israel the community came to recognize these words as God speaking to them. Once the words became an approved collection, this "collection" developed into the basic authority for Israel's **"RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEM."** The books that make up the Bible did not comprise the whole literary production of ancient Israel. The Scriptures make mention of the existence of an extensive literature which is now lost! Let us examine:

1. Numbers 21:14-The War of the Lords
2. Joshua 10:13 & II Samuel 1:18-Jashar
3. I Chron. 9:1 & 2 Chron 16:11; 20:34; 27:7; 32:32; 33:18-The Chronicles of the Kings of Israel and Judah.

In the process of **determining which books would be included in the canon** we have a record of the disputes between the rabbis as to the validity of certain writings. Customs and traditions were used as one of several guidelines for including or excluding questionable books. Other criteria included the content of the book and the position of the writer within Jewish history.

THE BIBLE YESHUA KNEW

The Bible as Yeshua knew it considered of some twelve to twenty scrolls of different sizes and did not include the New Testament which did not exist at that time. The writings we call the New Testament are grouped into the Gospels, Acts of the Apostles, Epistles, and the book of Revelation. One tradition indicates that about five years after the resurrection of Yeshua the true and real apostle Matthew wrote an original life story of Yeshua in the Hebrew language. The story was then copied into Greek and other languages. It appears that the writers of our modern Gospels used these copies and other information to write their Gospels.

Most of Paul's writings were in circulation prior to the writing of the four Gospels. Paul's letters began to exercise a powerful influence upon Christian life and thought. Nevertheless, it was a long time before Paul's letters were publicly read in the church or considered EQUAL to the words of the Tanakh. Paul's letters were the first step in creating the New Testament canon! By the year 200 C.E. a great variety of canons were in use, some fairly well defined, others more informal. Each reflects "local beliefs and traditions."

LET'S LOOK AT THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

Marcion, in 145 C.E., created a fixed canon which eliminated all of Yeshua's Bible (Tanakh) and most of the writings of the early Jewish believers with the exception of Paul and a part of Luke's Gospel. Several factions of Christianity (Messianic Judaism-the Yeshua Movement of the first century within Judaism) retained the Tanakh and most of today's New Testament canon but added as many as fourteen additional writings (called the Apocrypha). In northern Mesopotamia the early Messianic Community of Judaism (Christianity) included a Gospel of Thomas, since Thomas was the one who had brought the Gospel to that regions. Even after the canon officially closed in the late 4th century, new writings appeared that were considered "inspired" by those individual communities (notice there was no unity of opinion!). Early printed editions of Bibles in the Armenian church contained a book entitled, "Third Corinthians."

I am sure you can imagine the "erratic practices" that developed from one group to the next.

Answer for yourself: Where was to be the authority?

Answer for yourself: Had God already given it as the Jewish Scriptures and they overlooked it?

WHO IS RIGHT AND WHO IS WRONG?

Answer for yourself: Where was unity to be found with every community having their "own canon" and "authority" for their own beliefs actions, and often using "their canon" to correct other communities?

Such inconsistencies were perceived as a big danger by the leaders of the young Gentile Church. These inconsistencies between different communities prompted these leaders to define what was "sacred" or "inspired."

Answer for yourself: Who were these leaders and what were their credentials to decide what was "inspired" or "infallible" when they prayed to dead saints, baptized for the dead, prayer to Mary, and bought prayers for the dead to escape purgatory? Think for a minute about that.

Answer for yourself: How can we trust their other decisions knowing the terrible errors that they were immersed in? Finally, in the latter part of the 4th century the church's canon was closed. The last two books to be admitted were Hebrews and Revelation.

Once the canon was "closed" by the Gentile leaders of the Christian church (no longer a Jewish Messianic Movement within Judaism), the church was free to establish their doctrines and dogmas. Besides relying on the Scriptures, the Gentile leaders of the Christian community, particularly Irenaeus and Tertullian, did irreparable damage to "the faith" by relegating the Jewish Scriptures to "second place" in matters of doctrine and authority (the Gentile Church-the Roman Catholic Church was to be the primary authority). Tertullian developed a universal antidote for all heresy in his argument which cuts off heretics at the outset. He denied every right of appeal to the Holy Scriptures on the grounds that the Holy Scriptures were intrusted to the church of Christ, and only in her (Gentile Christian Church) and by her can they be rightly understood. This is totally blasphemous! For your information this violates Scripture for in Romans 9:3 the apostle Paul states: "Who are Israelites (notice he did not say Christians); to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the law, and the services of God, and the promises; whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever. Amen." Did you notice that Paul contradicts Tertullian by saying the Scriptures were given to Israel (and not the Roman Catholic Church) and from Israel would come the Scriptures teaching concerning covenants, law or commandments, services (worship), promises (again allusion to Scripture), and who has been established as the "authority" over all flesh by God....Israel!

REPLACEMENT THEOLOGY LIVES IN YOUR NEW TESTAMENT

Tertullian's "belief system" is an example of "replacement theology" which is so violently contrary to the Scripture of the Bible. The KJV version of the Bible says the exact opposite of what Tertullian and modern preachers preach today...God's authority was given in the Bible to Israel to teach and rightly interpret the Scriptures for the Gentiles! In this proclamation by Tertullian he establishes a "false" succession of Gentile authority and mistakenly gives it to the Gentile community in hopes to protect them from sects of heretics.

There is only one problem! The Jews were not the heretics, in fact, the Jews are the vehicle given to us, the Gentile church, by which we are to learn about the Jewish Scriptures (every book in the Jewish Bible was written by Jews and not one was written by a Gentile). Ironically, in supposedly protecting the Gentile church from error, he accomplished what he tried to prevent. We need only look to the over 2000 different Protestant denominations present today, with over 1500 different interpretations of the same Bible, and the lack of unity which abounds among them to discern that at least 1499 have not rightly divided the Word of Truth.

Answer for yourself: Why so much diversity and so little unity?

The reason; God gave the Jews as the interpreters of the Jewish Book called the Bible and not the Gentiles. For me to say that a Baptist's interpretation of the Bible is just as valid and correct as the Jew's interpretation of the Bible is no less ludicrous than saying that an Apache Indian is just as valid an interpreter of Eskimo tribal legends as the Eskimo himself. Think about that for a moment.

At the end of the 15th century when, through the actions of Martin Luther, the Protestant Reformation was born, this "choke-hold" of Roman Catholic authority had to be wrestled from Rome. The mechanism for achieving this was the Bible. Martin Luther simply removed the Catholic Church as the final authority and substituted his personal belief system and deleted the Apocrypha from the Catholic Bible. The effect of this was that he not only created a "new Bible," the Protestant Bible, but he provided a new standard for interpretation for the Bible.

Answer for yourself: First of all, don't you think it strange that a Catholic priest create a Protestant Bible?

The effect of Luther deleting sacred books from the Bible helped to give authority to the Gentile leaders of the newly emerging religious community and the people of God to interpret or misinterpret Scriptures for

themselves as they pleased. Training and education in Scriptural analysis, both linguistical, historical, cultural, and political was not necessary according to Luther. The Holy Spirit will guide us into all truth. Really now! I know Christians that will tell me the same thing as Luther, that the Holy Spirit taught me...this...or that...yet they are 180 degrees opposite in their understanding on the same matter.

Answer for yourself: How can the Holy Spirit teach of the same doctrine yet arrive at diametrically opposite conclusions and not be schizophrenic?

HOW DID WE GET SO FAR FROM THE TRUTH?

History teaches us that five factors fueled the growth of the Protestant movement and paved the way for countless numbers of denominations, non-denominations, inter-denominations and cults in the 20th century:

- a broad-based public acceptance of an anti-Catholic movement
- a new belief system whose aim was to protest against the established system
- the translation of the Bible into the modern language of the people
- invention of the printing press giving the masses access to the Bible
- the acceptance of untrained leaders as authorities and authoritative interpreters of the Bible (remember the Apaches and the Eskimos?)

Answer for yourself: What has history recorded for us concerning the last four hundred and fifty years since Martin Luther began his protest?

Even before his death Luther was confronted by those who were protesting "his" belief system and within a few years the cycle was repeated over and over again.

HOW CAN WE NOT REPEAT THE SAME MISTAKES OF HISTORY?

Today, society, both ethical and religious, is overcome by sectarianism.

Answer for yourself: Is there a cure for this malady?

For those willing to pay the price the answer is "yes."

We must be willing to go back behind Protestantism, Catholicism, and Rabbinic Judaism, back to the time period in which the concept of canon began to first take hold. We must begin with the "faith once given to the saints." Such a faith is the faith of Yeshua...Second Temple Judaism.

We must begin with our first feeble steps trying to understand what was common to all canons....the Hebrew Tanakh (see beginning of this paper). To do this we must examine the culture of the people who gave us the Tanakh. Since the majority of the words from the New Testament originate in the Tanakh, and since these New Testament writers were faithful members of the early Jewish community, we will also need to examine their words as understood from their own culture, within their own time period, and according to the original language they were spoken from...the Jewish language.

If our understanding of the Bible is different from the understanding we would have had in the first century...they we have the wrong understanding today. If the words of our Bible are interpreted in English, and they have different meanings when examined from the Jewish viewpoint, then we have the wrong meanings attached to these words today, regardless of what Webster says. Once we have this information we will be able to examine Judaic, Catholic, and Protestant belief systems and their

how did we get so far off track yet we had a bible?

interpretations of these Scriptures. With the wrong interpretation, with the wrong meanings attached to English words, and with little study on our parts to discern the truth in order to obey the Scriptures, can God be pleased with our mistaken disobedience?

Let us now turn to a intense study of the Canon of the New Testament and it's cumulative formation in 380 C.E.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



ANTISEMITISM AND ITS PREVALENCE IN CHRISTIAN THEOLOGY

At its roots, anti-Semitism in Christian civilization springs from Christian theological anti-Judaism, the German professor told the audience. From the cruel taunts of children, to pogroms, the crusades, the Spanish Inquisition and the Holocaust, the Gospel accounts of Yeshua's arrest, trial, abuse, and crucifixion - still read in churches today - have served as a fountainhead of anti-Semitism.

Basically anti-Semitism arose in the early Christian church as a reaction against Judaism over the concept of the Messiah as well as the Law.

Anti-Judaism developed theologically in Christianity as the left hand of Christology, the branch of theology dealing with the person and the deeds of Yeshua as the son of God....anti-Judaism was the negative side of the Christian claim that Yeshua was the Christ.

Christianity saw itself as the fulfillment of Judaic messianism, but since the Jewish tradition rejected this claim, Christianity developed a polemic against the Jewish tradition to explain how Christianity could be the fulfillment of a Jewish religious tradition that Jews themselves had rejected.

It was Christian theology which developed the thesis of the eternal reprobate, the damned status of the Jew in history, and laid the foundation for the demonic view of the Jews which fanned the flames of popular hatred,...This hatred became incorporated into the structure of Christian canon law and civil law formed under Christendom.

It is important for Christianity to deal fully with its role in the history of anti-Semitism. Christian churches have to break with the theology of triumphalism and work towards a theology of hope. The primary source for such hatred is the New Testament as the vast majority of it's religious and theological doctrines are anti-Judaic and this is amazing since the center of the book revolves around a Jewish Rabbi (THINK)!



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE CONFLICT WITH JUDAISM AND HELLENISM IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Christianity started as a sect of Judaism by the followers of Yeshua. The faith which emerged after his death was built sadly upon a mixture of two different religions: Judaism and Hellenism. The former provided the scripture and legitimacy for the new religion. The latter furnished new interpretations to that literature and its symbols. Even a cursory glance at the books of the New Testament reveals the copious use of quotations and references to the Tanakh (many of which are not correctly quoted on purpose). Subsequently, disparate meanings, which were ascribed to those Hebrew Scriptures, sanctioned the new tenets which helped create the new religion which shunned its mother...Biblical Judaism. These novel beliefs stemmed from Hellenism. As the famous Protestant theologian, Reinhold Niebuhr, put it,...

"The Christian faith is an amalgam of Hebraic and Hellenistic elements"
(Reinhold Niebuhr, Pious and Secular America, p. 108).

Gentile Christianity inherited much of the philosophy, customs, and flavor of the pagan Hellenistic world. Hellenism itself absorbed religious beliefs from other nations. Mystery-cults and Gnosticism were pagan ideas imported into Hellenism where they were further developed and expanded. Many of these concepts in turn were accepted into Christianity as it spread to the Greek and Roman world.

"The concept of the incarnation of a divine being in human form appears in various pagan cults, Greek, Egyptian, and oriental, which were current in Paul's day in the Near East, and which environmental influences predisposed the Apostle to think in terms of incarnation in interpreting his new faith to pagan peoples" (S.G.F. Brandon, The Fall of Jerusalem, pp. 67-68).

CHRISTIANITY---A SYNTHESIS OF JUDAISM AND THE GENTILE'S PAGAN MYSTERY CULTS

The Gentile pagan's mystery cults were based on death and resurrection of a God and the object was to enable the initiate to take part in this death and resurrection and so attain eternal life. In a typical cult an animal was killed which represented the slain God. In some of the rites the animal's blood was poured over the initiate. In others, the flesh was eaten and the blood drunk by initiates into the cult (the beginning of the **eucharist**). The rite was practiced in the spring corresponding to Easter time (H. Maccoby, *Revolution in Judea*, pp. 87-88). The Bacchus rites involved eating raw meat as a way of sharing in the life of the God. This concept is not too remote from the Eucharist (Howard C. Kee, Understanding the New Testament, Fourth Edition, pp. 27-28). Some cults developed a belief in the advantages derived from a God's death which went beyond the immediate benefits of agricultural fertility. The death of the God brought spiritual redemption

to all mankind. The evil forces of the people causing the God's demise were transformed, against the killers' will or knowledge, into the means of salvation. Thus the God's death became a sacrifice as a means of bringing good into the world.

CHRISTIANITY-A SYNTHESIS OF JUDAISM AND GNOSTICISM

Gnosticism was another Hellenistic movement whose ideas influenced Christianity thanks to Paul and Marcion (<http://paulproblem.faithweb.com/>) It is a system of belief combining ideas from Oriental mysticism and Greek philosophy. It stresses salvation through **gnosis** or intuitive knowledge in spiritual matters. Gnosticism has a dualistic view of life in that the world is seen as containing two opposing forces, good and evil. The Jewish God, Jehovah, was considered to be a demon or devil who created this evil world. The good was represented by a Savior, Soter in Greek. **Soter was also called the "Son of God " and was one of a trinity of g-ds.** He would redeem mankind by his suffering and release it from the evil Demiurge. Many of the Gnostic writings were anti-Jewish, reflecting the Jewish-Greek cultural rivalry. The dichotomy in Gnosticism was further seen in the conflict between body and soul and the contempt it expressed for sexuality in human nature (Maccoby, *The Mythmaker: Paul And The Invention Of Christianity*, p. 88-89).

CHRISTIANITY-A SYNTHESIS OF JUDAISM WITH GREEK MYTHOLOGY

Greek and Roman mythology included a pantheon of g-ds who regularly had relations with humans. The resulting offspring of a heavenly deity and a human female was considered a God. Zeus, the supreme deity of the Greeks, procreated with mortal women who were other men's wives. To give but one example: Apollo, God of light and truth, medicine and prophecy, was the offspring of a union of Zeus and the mortal Leto or Latona (Edith Hamilton, *Mythology*, p. 30).

Many of the ideas found in mystery-cults, Gnosticism, and Greco-Roman mythology contain elements which are found in Christian theology. For example, just as there is a dying and resurrection in the mystery cult, so Yeshua was transformed from a mortal into a deity after his "sacrificial" death on the cross. The God in the mystery religion was resurrected, as was Yeshua according to Christian theology. After he was resurrected, the pagan God was worshipped. Following Yeshua's resurrection, his apostles began to venerate him. Finally, the death of the heathen God in the mystery-cult brought spiritual benefit to his followers. Yeshua's death has been viewed as the source of salvation by and for his adherents.

Gnosticism postulates the doctrine of a good God and a bad God. Christianity reflects this dualism in its concept of the harsh Jewish God and the loving, kind divinity, Yeshua. The Gnostic Savior or the Soter, brought salvation to mankind as did Yeshua to his believers. Yeshua, like the Soter, was called the son of God and was one of a trinity. The redemption of mankind through the suffering of Yeshua is another doctrine paralleling the Gnostic belief that the Soter released humanity from evil through his suffering.

The mythological concept of a heavenly deity fathering the offspring of a human woman resembles the Christian credo of God as father of Yeshua and the mortal Mary as his mother.

The similarity between Hellenistic religious beliefs and Christian theology was expressed by Hugh Schonfield as follows:

"It was upon an image of God partaking strongly of the characteristics of ancient heathenism that the Christian faith was founded" (Hugh Schonfield, *Those Incredible Christians*, pp. 205-207). **It is those features which irrevocably divorced Christianity from its parent religion and created a chasm between them.**

WHAT ELSE COULD HAPPEN....BUT CONFLICT BETWEEN JUDAISM AND GENTILE HELLENISM

The religious philosophies of the Hellenistic world were rejected by most Jews just as they had spurned other pagan religions in the ancient world; therefore they reject Christianity today because it is pagan to the core (but you have to study to see this)! This does not mean that over the centuries Jews were never attracted to the religious practices of other people. At the eve of Biblical prophecy was condemnation and rebuke of the nation for imitating its neighbors and their heathen customs. From antiquity assimilation has been a Hebrew or Jewish problem.

However, the vast majority of Jews repudiated such beliefs as human sacrifice, polytheism, and deification of a human into a God. These beliefs were as much a part of Hellenism as were the magnificent Greek art and sculpture. Jews had progressed beyond idolatry and paganism long before Hellenism became dominant. By the time the Judeans returned from Babylonian exile at the end of the sixth century B.C.E. (after 538), they had purged themselves of heathenism. Later books in the Hagiographa (Sacred Writings, the third part of the Tanakh), as well as apocryphal books, indicate that the idolatry which had so plagued the Israelites during the Prophetic period no longer posed a problem to their religious integrity. Even the Essenes whom Josephus characterized as worshipping the sun (<http://bennoah1.freewebsites.com/>) and (<http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com/>) apparently did this as a manifestation of God. This custom was not found at Qumran. No group or sect postulated a duality in its concept of God.

When Judaism and Hellenism squared off on the battlefields in Judea, Samaria, and Galilee in the Maccabean Wars, the battles were fought as much for religious freedom from the forced paganism of the Greeks as for political independence from them. The Jews won. They maintained their religion and held on to their national independence for a century until their confrontation with Rome.

Although Jews fought arduously for their religious and political freedom against Greek encroachments on it, they were open to some elements of Hellenistic culture and influenced by it. This was true of the Talmudic rabbis as well as the upper and middle classes. Gamliel, who is mentioned in the New Testament, headed an academy in which, according to his son, Simeon, as many young men studied Greek wisdom as studied Torah (Saul Lieberman, *Greek in Jewish Palestine*, pp. 1, 20). Greek words appear in the Jerusalem Talmud and the Midrash in Hebrew letters. Greek proverbs and stories are found in the rabbinic literature of the Talmud, Midrash, and Tosefta. The Tosefta is rabbinic literature written during the tannaitic period which was approximately the first two centuries of the common era. The Midrash is a method of interpreting the Hebrew Bible to elucidate legal points (halakha) or homiletics (aggada). This genre of rabbinic literature extended from the fourth to the thirteenth century, or even beyond. The rabbis even accepted Greek forms of behavior and adapted them to Judaism such as participation in athletics and interest in astrology (S. Lieberman, *op. cit.*, pp. 92-114).

Most of the Greek culture and language which penetrated into Jewish society in Judea, outside of the aristocracy, occurred after 70 C.E. The Hasmonean dynasty had absorbed Greek culture over a century earlier. The upper and middle classes were quicker to assimilate the Hellenistic idiom than were the lower classes.

Greeks resented Jews for not adopting the Greek religion along with other parts of Hellenistic culture. Perhaps the persistence of Jews in sticking to their beliefs and refusing to go along with the popularly accepted values, "the idols of the marketplace," contributed to their unpopularity. Strength of character combined with sincere attachment and stubborn commitment carry a heavy price.

There was intense rivalry between Jews and Greeks in the Roman Empire for cultural dominance. Jews had a higher proportion of literacy. They had an older culture and while Jewish art could not match that of the Greeks, their literature was in many ways superior. The Greeks controlled the cultural policies of the Empire and afforded no recognition to the Hebrew language and culture. They ignored it or distorted it.

In short, the Greeks considered their culture superior to that of the Jews--or of any other people. Traditional Greek anti-Semitism derived from a conviction of the superiority of their culture to that of the Jews with which they were unfamiliar. They were surprised and repelled by the stubborn persistence of Jews in adhering to the religion and ethical values of their faith. Other nations, upon contact with Hellenism, had succumbed to it, thus acknowledging its cultural superiority to theirs...but not the Jews...they had the truth!

The Jews, while impressed with Greek literature, art, and philosophy, did not find its social institutions and theological beliefs worthy of emulation. The Greeks ridiculed such Jewish religious practices as observing a day of rest each week (Sabbath), dietary restrictions, and circumcision, as well as ethical values to which Jews clung. **Until the Maccabean Wars there was no anti-Jewish Greek writings or expression of hostility to the Jews.** Nevertheless in later antiquity such manifestation of Hellenistic animosity to Jews did exist. The malice which many Greeks bore to the Jews was well illustrated in Apion's writing to which Josephus responded. Infanticide and widespread slavery within their own population were accepted practices in Greek society. They had been forbidden in Jewish law since it was given at Sinai about 1400 years earlier.

Jewish and Greek communities lived together with varying degrees of harmony and disharmony. In Sardis there seems to have been no evidence of conflict; in Antioch cultural rivalry was strong; in Alexandria there was a great deal of hostility between the two peoples. The Egyptian metropolis had large Jewish and Greek populations. There were periodic clashes between them. Unfortunately, the repeated outbreaks against the Jews in Alexandria speak more clearly of the Greek attitude toward the Jews than most books. The rioting lasted from 38 to 41 and Claudius described it as wars against the Jews. The violence broke out because the Jews requested citizenship in a city in which they had lived for centuries. So strong was Greek opposition to the granting of equality to Jews that they formed delegations to Rome to oppose it. In 38 C.E. Greeks led anti-Jewish riots which persisted for three years. Jews had lived in Alexandria for centuries where they were legal residents but not citizens. The riots were precipitated when Jews requested Roman citizenship which the Greek residents had. The Greeks sent an embassy to Emperor Claudius led by Apion to protest the granting of that citizenship. The Jewish embassy to the emperor was led by Philo of Alexandria, the great Jewish philosopher and Biblical commentator. Claudius mediated between the two conflicting parties. He assured the rights of the Jews to religious freedom and protection against Greek harassment but did not grant them citizenship (Josephus, Antiquities, 19:5).

The attacks on Jews in Alexandria were renewed in 66 at the time of the outbreak of the First Roman-Jewish War in Judea. The Greeks jumped on this opportunity to assault the Jews of their city knowing that their brethren were at war with Rome and thereby less likely to receive Roman legal protection. The Greeks brought to Christianity a residue of pagan anti-Semitism.

While the rivalry between Judaism and Hellenism was founded on deep cultural and religious differences, there were also other factors. Both nations, Judea and Greece, had enjoyed independence and both lost it to Rome. The Greeks submitted. The Jews fought. In Judea they engaged in two wars. The First Jewish Revolt lasted from 66 to 73; the Second Jewish War or Bar Kokhba Revolt continued from 132 to 135. Between 115 and 117 there was a Diaspora Revolt in which Jews of Cyprus and North Africa rose against Rome. The Greeks resented the Jews for their courage in standing up to the might of Rome while they had yielded. Jewish bravery was a painful reminder of their own subservience and a blow to their pride.

The Roman government treated the Jews relatively well even after their wars of rebellion. They reviled the Jews for rebelling against them, but they did not represent them as the incarnation of evil. Religious privileges and civil rights of Jews were protected by Rome against Gentile infringements and continued unaffected by the revolt of 66- 73 (Oxford Classical Dictionary, p. 564). Despite three bitterly fought Roman-Jewish wars, the Romans did not abandon the policy of protecting the rights of the Jewish communities. The Romans treated the Jews in their empire with respect until Christianity became the state religion. Prior to that time the Roman emperors had resisted efforts by church authorities to dissolve the status of Judaism as a protected religion. The official policies of Rome gave Jews religious freedom to observe their Sabbath free of civic duties, to send donations to the Temple at Jerusalem, and to settle disputes within their community by themselves. Although

for the most part, they were not granted citizenship and were taxed as non-citizens, Jews were accepted in all levels of society including aristocratic, intellectual, and ruling circles. anti-Semitic voices, such as Juvenal, Cicero, Tacitus, and Seneca, were not the only ones heard. Among the elite there were defenders and admirers of Jews. Longinius, Dio, and Pliny were among sympathetic Roman writers (J. Gager, The Origins of Anti-Semitism, p. 75,80).

In 312 C.E. Constantine became emperor of the Roman Empire. In the following year he granted favored status to Christianity. By 380 Christianity became the official state religion and an endless night of despair and anguish descended on Jews.

"There was a dramatic reversal in the imperial policy towards the Jews. Christian emperors succumbed to ecclesiastical pressure by translating theological anti-Judaism into imperial legislation"
(J. Gager, The Origins of Anti-Semitism p. 97).

It was this clerical pressure to which the Roman emperor acceded in 429 when he disbanded the Sanhedrin. And we as non-Jewish believers are the inheritors of such in the Gentile Christian Church today. It is no wonder that Christianity, as it is practiced today, bears little resemblance to the faith and religion of Yeshua. Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



NEW TESTAMENT TRANSMISSION...CAN WE BE ASSURED OF THE TRUTH?

Answer for yourself: After 2,000 years of transmission and translation, does the New Testament accurately convey the meaning of the original authors and the truth as known and accepted by Yeshua and his hearers?

We have about 5,000 Greek manuscripts that contain at least a "portion" of the New Testament, but in many places, they do not agree exactly on wording. And most of the earliest copies are 100 to 200 years later than the originals. From a historical perspective, how accurately does the modern Bible reflect the content of the original manuscripts?

For most of its long history, the Bible was copied by hand. You may be wondering how easy was it for a mistake to enter into this process? Whenever something is copied by hand, frailties of human eyesight enter in, particularly if that document is old and some ink has faded. Copying is also long, tedious work. It would take a scribe several months to copy just one Gospel. In some secular Greek manuscripts, scribes left a note at the end that indicates the patient labor involved: "As the traveler rejoices to see the home country, so the scribe rejoices to see the end of a manuscript!"

The invention of eyeglasses around 1375 certainly helped reduce the number of mistakes. And the invention of printing with movable type in 1456 assured production of duplicate copies. But prior to that, for over a thousand years, everything was done by hand, and the more times an ancient text was copied, the more chance for errors to creep in.

That brings us to another question: How reliable are the Greek and Hebrew manuscripts we have today? The earlier copies are generally closer to the wording of the originals. The translators of the 1611 King James Bible, for instance, used Greek and Hebrew manuscripts from the twelfth and thirteenth centuries. But the number of changes since the first century is anyone's guess.

Today Bible translators have access to Greek manuscripts from the third and fourth centuries and Hebrew manuscripts from the era of Jesus. In other words, today we have access to "better" manuscripts than that were used by the editors of the King James Bible in 1611. Let that sink in a minute!

We even have the Rylands Papyrus, just a torn page with a few verses from John 18, that we can date between C.E. 100 and 150. So today we have access to a text of the Old and New Testaments that is more basic, more fundamental, less open to charges of scribal error or change.

Since manuscripts rarely have dates on them, we must judge the date by the handwriting. Handwriting styles differ with the times. So we compare the handwriting of a manuscript with that of deeds and bills of sale and other documents that do include dates which archeologist have provided for us through their excavations. In addition, sometimes a scribal note in the margin or on the dedication page gives away the period in which the manuscript was copied.

Most of the earliest surviving New Testament manuscripts are 100 to 200 years later than the originals. By contrast, our copies of other ancient writings, like those of Virgil or Homer, are often many hundreds of years later than their originals. In some of those writings, we have only one copy! The New Testament, on the other hand, has many copies.

Of more importance is that of all the manuscripts discovered, some passages have been affected by scribal changes. For example, take Mark 9:29. Jesus is explaining how he was able to cast out a demon, and in the earliest manuscripts, he is quoted as saying, "This kind can come out only by prayer." In the Greek manuscripts the KJV translators used, the two words "and fasting" are tacked on. I wish I could say this is the extent of such deception but it is not. Thus the need for our websites in hopes of waring and teaching others about the problems surrounding their "inspired" texts which they trust for their faith and practice.

By studying manuscript history, we see that the words "and fasting" were inserted between 300 C.E. and 600 C.E. These were the years of the "desert" Catholic fathers and the birth of monasticism (Monks). The number of official fast days was increasing, and the regimens of fasting were becoming more strict. Probably a devout scribe, himself part of a fasting tradition, believed that Jesus must have meant to include "and fasting," so he included the two words.

Some Bibles list three endings for the Gospel of Mark. The earliest Greek, Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and Latin manuscripts end the Gospel of Mark at 16:8: "The women said nothing to anyone, for they were afraid." That does not sound like an appropriate ending for a book of good news, so some early scribes, undertaking their own research, added what they thought would be appropriate endings. A few later manuscripts add just two or three verses to this abrupt ending, but most contain a longer ending, what we now number as verses 9 to 20. We can tell by examining the vocabulary that these endings were not written by Mark. So translators often put them in brackets or as a long footnote.

Why not just keep them out of the Bible? Yet many translators consider verses 9 through 20 to be a legitimate part of the New Testament.

In the third and fourth centuries, when Gentile Catholic church fathers were deciding which books should be included in the New Testament, these verses were already in the copies of Mark that most of them were using. In other words, some in the early church considered verses 9 through 20 to be a credible account of the Resurrection. Though these verses were not written by Mark, many believe we have here a fifth evangelical witness to the resurrection of Jesus. I'll let you judge that for yourself.

The tragic result of these additions by monks is that well-meaning, God-fearing believers have misinterpreted passages added to their Bibles that should have never been there. If you will read these passages for yourself, you will see how multitudes have died, and many still die as they drink deadly poisons and handle rattlesnakes to demonstrate their faith for God.

By the year 600, the Gospels had been translated into only eight languages. By the time of the Reformation, there were Bibles or portions of it translated into only 33 languages--out of a total of about 6,000 languages! It is discouraging to see how slow the church was in providing translations of the Holy Scriptures.

Not until the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, with the expansion of the Protestant missionary movement, has the Bible been translated into more dialects. According to the American Bible Society, at the end of 1993, the entire Bible has been translated into 329 languages, and at least one book of it has been translated into 2,009 languages. That means, of course, that a good many languages still lack even one book of the Bible.

On the other hand, since 85 percent of the world speaks one of these 2,009 languages, the vast majority of people have access to at least one book. The Wycliffe Bible Translators and others have done wonderful work in reducing many languages to written form and then translating the Bible into them. In terms of the English Bible, it seems that the last few decades have been extraordinary years of translation. Between 1952, when the Revised Standard Version came out, and 1990, when the New RSV came out, there were 27 complete translations of the Bible in English published, plus another 25 New Testament translations--all within 38 years. That is unprecedented in the history of translation.

Part of this flurry of translation activity is related to manuscript discoveries; when we discover still more ancient biblical manuscripts or ancient secular manuscripts that shed light on ancient languages, people naturally want that information reflected in their Bibles. Sadly, when presented with facts that challenge false-faith, too few repent of the errors of their beliefs and fail to accept the higher truths.

With this heightened translation in the last century, many different religious groups--Roman Catholics, moderate and conservative Protestants, and Jews--have each wanted their own translations. This is partly due to the economic factor: the Bible is a best-seller, so many publishing companies have been inclined to sponsor and publish new versions.

Answer for yourself: With so many Bible translations available, are English-speaking people more biblically literate than in the past? I am not sure. In the first 1,500 years of the church's history, literacy was low, and there were not many copies of the Scriptures available to read. Of the 5,000 Greek manuscripts of the New Testament now available, only 59 have all 27 books. That means that few congregations, and far fewer individuals, had access to all of the New Testament, let alone the whole Bible.

Today we live in a culture of relatively high literacy, but we also have many, many newspapers, magazines, and books to read. In addition, radio, television, and the movies are a major distraction from reading. In some ways, then, people who can read probably are not as familiar with the Bible as those who could read in previous eras. Let this fact settle in for a moment!

THIS SHOULD BLOW YOU AWAY

Now before I part a most alarming fact that never ceases to alarm and stagger the typical Christian once he come to an understanding of what is actually being said. The following is quoted from "Text, NT," from the Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, 2nd edition, (Abingdon, 1962), p. 595-598:

"A study of 150 Greek MSS (manuscripts) of the Gospel of Luke has revealed more than 30,000 different readings...It is safe to say that there is not one sentence in the NT in which the MS (manuscript) tradition is wholly uniform...But there are many thousands which have a definite effect upon the meaning of the text...It is equally true that many of them do have theological significance and were introduced into the text intentionally...Many thousands of variants which are found in the MSS of the NT were put there deliberately. They are not merely the result of error or of careless handling of the text. Many were created for theological or dogmatic reasons. It is because the books of the NT are religious books, sacred books, canonical books, that they were changed to conform to what the copyist believed to be the true reading. His interest was not in the "original reading" but in the "true reading"- as perceived by the Roman goyim (Gentiles), Christian redactors, or course".

After reading this maybe you may be more serious about your study of the documents you rely upon for your faith and practice, especially in light of the fact that Yeshua is a Jew and the early faith for the church and followers of Yeshua was Biblical Judaism where the non-Jew was grafted into Israel and was partaker of the root and fatness of the Olive Tree of Israel and not as we see today.....a replacement religion bent upon the conversion of every Jew in hopes of obliterating the faith and religion of Yeshua. Only God knows the complete story of the additions and deletions contained in the New Testament and sadly 2.5 billion "believers" follow

the new testament's transmission...can we assured of the truth?

such a document unquestioningly.

More to follow.



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #1

TYNDALE-"ON READING THE BANNED BIBLE":

Tyndale's comfort to persecuted Bible readers is left for our examination today: "Let it not make thee despair, neither yet discourage thee, O reader, that it is forbidden thee in pain of life and goods, or that it is made breaking of the king's peace, or treason unto his highness, to read the Word of thy soul's health;...for if God be on our side, what matter maketh it who be against us, be they bishops, cardinals, popes..." It is hard to believe that for the majority of the time since the apostolic community, the people of God were deprived of their right to own, read, and study the Bible, yet today, with the proliferation of Bibles and ease of access to Bibles in our day and time, that Biblical illiteracy is at an all time high...possibly greater than ever before in the history of mankind.

TYNDALE'S ANSWER TO THE CHURCH'S FIVE OBJECTIONS TO YOU OWNING AND READING THE BIBLE:

- They tell you that Scripture ought not to be in the mother tongue, but that is only because they fear the light, and desire to lead you blindfold and in captivity...
- They say that Scripture needs a pure and quiet mind, and that laymen are too cumbered with worldly business to understand it. This weapon strikes themselves: for who is so tangled with worldly matters as the prelates?
- They say that laymen would interpret it each after his own way. Why then do the curates not teach the people the right way? The Scripture would be a basis for such teaching and a test of it. At present their lives and their teaching are so contrary that the people do not believe them, even when they preach truth...
- They say our tongue is too rude. It is not so. Greek and Hebrew go more easily into English than into Latin. Has not God made the English tongue as well as others? They suffer you to read in English of Robin Hood, Bevis of Hampton, Hercules, Troilus, and a thousand ribald or filthy tales. It is only the Scripture that is forbidden. It is therefore clearer than the sun that this forbiddal is not "for love of your souls, which they care for as the fox doth for the geese."
- They say we need doctors to interpret Scripture [because] it is so hard... There are errors even in Origen and Augustine; how can we test them save by the Scripture?... We do not wish to abolish teaching and to make every man his own master, but if the curates will not teach the gospel, the layman must have the Scripture, and read it for himself, taking God for his teacher.

There has been from the beginning of "religion" the attempts of the Priestcraft to keep it's follower "ignorant" of religion and rely upon "superstition" and the "mystical" instead of facts. The same can be said for Christianity and Roman Catholicism during the Dark Ages. Protestantism is little better. As long as the

parishioners are "Biblically illiterate and ignorant" then they will be led around by the whims and ambitions of clergy masqueraded as "God's will." It is long past time that you take responsibility for studying out what you "believe" and what you have been taught to accept "by faith" in order to determine if you are a "true follower" of Yeshua and a part of "the faith once given to the saints." What you find will not only scare you if you become dedicated to serious study but bring repentance in your life which will assure you of a stronger relationship with God and a true assurance that you have now a "faith in truth" and not a "faith in lies."

LET US LOOK AT THE BIBLE:

The word Bible is derived from the Greek "biblia", meaning "books," and refers to the sacred writings of Judaism and Christianity. The Bible consists of two parts. The first part, called the Old Testament by Christians, consists of the sacred writings of the Jewish people and was written originally in Hebrew, except for some portions in Aramaic. The second part, called the New Testament, was composed in Hebrew and Greek and records the story of Jesus and the beginnings of Christianity. Today, Bible scholars have verified that much of the Gospels had originally been written originally in Hebrew only to later be translated into Greek for Greek-speaking audiences. Translated in whole or in part into more than 1,500 languages, the Bible is the most widely distributed book in the world. Its influence on history and culture, including literature and the other arts, is incalculable.

DO I HAVE THE BIBLE JESUS USED?...IF YOU ARE A CHRISTIAN YOU DON'T!

This may come as a shock to you, because you already think that you have the bible that Jesus desires you to have, but you do not carry the Bible or the collection of Books that not only Jesus used for his authority, but his disciples and followers as well. You will probably want to disagree with the previous statement, but the facts speak for themselves. We don't have Yeshua's Bible! You are not reading the same scriptures in your churches that were read in the churches and synagogues of the first century. I always thought that Christianity used the same Bible as Jesus until I began to study for myself. I had a rude awakening. It is time for you to awake also!

Answer for yourself: Which Bible should be used as the ultimate authority for modern Christianity...the Jewish Bible, the Catholic Bible, or the Protestant Bible?

DID YOU KNOW THAT DIFFERENT BIBLES MEAN DIFFERENT BELIEF SYSTEMS?

As both a pastor and Bible scholar, I believe that the Religious Belief System of every Christian should be as close as possible to the Religious Belief System of Jesus.

Answer for yourself: What do you think?

Answer for yourself: Wouldn't it be absolutely insane for a Christian to have a Religious Belief System that was not only in opposition to, but also an insult to many things that Jesus believed and taught? Well it has happened and you, the average Christian, and most likely you are even aware that it has!

"Not me" you say, well read on!

I ask you as a Christian to face reality as it is laid open to you in these articles, and make whatever changes are necessary in your belief system as well as your life. God would have you do so. Let's us examine the issues

together. Let us begin with Yeshua's Bible.

WHAT BIBLE DID JESUS USE?

The first step in assuring ourselves that we have the same Religious Belief System of Jesus is to agree as to the same Bible Jesus used for the authority for his beliefs. The Bible of the Jew in the first century A.D. consisted of 12-20 scrolls of varying lengths. None of the scrolls contained the writings which are now called the Catholic New Testament or the Protestant New Testament! Most of the writings found in the Catholic New Testament (from which we get the Protestant New Testament) would not be written for another twenty to sixty years! That means that the Great Commission was started without a New Testament! Why? Because for Jesus, as well as his disciples and Apostles, nothing had the authority to compare with the Old Testament Scriptures that had been given at Mt. Sinai. Nothing was comparable with the Torah (God's Teachings and Instructions). According to Biblical scholars, it would be until another 10 years or so following the crucifixion of Jesus before the apostle Matthew would write down the life story of Jesus in Hebrew (called the Logia-which is lost to us today). This was the first record of an attempt to record the words of Jesus.

Answer for yourself: Let me ask you, why did the apostolic community decide to wait so long (written records were compiled well up until 70 A.D. and afterwards) to record the words of Jesus?

Answer for yourself: Even more important, why were Yeshua's words, or more importantly, the words of his followers not recorded for almost a generation or so, unless they were not considered on the same level of authority as the "Scriptures" that they already possessed; namely, the Old Testament?"

It would not be until 380 A.D. before we would have an "accepted" Canon (Catholic) for the New Testament.

Answer for yourself: Can you possibly imagine that Yeshua would say "Go ye into all the world..but shucks... I won't have the manual ready for you for 400 years? What did they "teach" then in this Great Commission for up to 400 years before the creation and official canonization of the New Testament which can be shown to contain many "doctrines" and "teachings" that contradict many major tenants of Biblical faith which Yeshua both believed and taught?

Answer for yourself: Do you realize, that the Great Commission had been obeyed for over 380 years before we had "another authority" that would eventually replace the "authority" that Jesus relied upon; namely, the Hebraic Old Testament Scriptures that were composed of the Law, Prophets, and Writings?

It might surprise you but it would be almost another twenty years or so after the cross of Jesus before Paul would write his first epistle! That means he began to write about 50-55 A.D. which is around twenty to twenty-five years after the death of Jesus.

WHAT DID THE NEW FLEDGLING MESSIANIC COMMUNITY USE FOR THEIR BIBLES BEFORE THE CREATION OF THE CATHOLIC CANON OF 380 A.D.?

Answer for yourself: What Bible did the Apostles carry with them, as well as others, as they went into all the world to preach the Gospel? They had no New Testament.

After Paul's epistles were in circulation for about ten to twenty years the authors of Luke and Mark decided to write their Gospels. This would be around 70 C.E., just prior to the time that the Second Temple was destroyed by the Romans. Again, this might surprise you, but it would be another 70 years before anyone would decide that a collection of writings from the Messianic Community should

be gathered together as a rival authority for the Old Testament (140 C.E.)! Marcion, the heretic, would combine (most probably) the Gospel of Luke with some of Paul's writings which would become the first of many replacements for Yeshua's Bible.

We now have a new canon in the making and it will become "the authority" that would eventually replace "the authority" of Yeshua's Bible for the Messianic Community. We will develop a new canon to replace the canon of Yeshua

More to follow



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #2

WHAT IS THE PURPOSE OF A CANON (BIBLE)?

It is a documented fact that a religion cannot exist without a revelation. The Bible is a book that contains "revelations" which are authoritative for a religious community. There are many religious communities, thus there are many Bibles. It is through these revelations that a religious community develops its understanding of God and God's requirements for mankind.

Man is limited in his knowledge of God, and it is by the vehicle of revelation that man received knowledge of God that is outside of his natural ability to know or discern. The major obstacle confronting man in his search for God is that the reality of God is beyond discernment through man's senses. Man's knowledge is limited to the information that he receives from his sensory organs: hear, taste, touch, feel, see. But when we talk of the supernatural realm and not the natural realm, then everything changes. Man does not have the capability to penetrate into God's dimension at will. What we know of God is because God desired to reveal it to man. We must wait for God to break into our dimension and show Himself first. Since it is God, and not man, who determines when and where and how contact is to be made with His creation, then our knowledge about God is limited to the information that God chooses to reveal about Himself. After God makes contact with the natural realm and imparts His message, the resultant message is called a "revelation." The accumulation of "revelations" over time becomes the cornerstone of what a community or group of people come to understand about God. Such a group of revelations is called the community's "canon" or "Bible". It is my personal opinion that today we receive no new revelations from God; only illumination from the Holy Spirit concerning past revelations.

It is easy to see that the canon or Bible of such a community becomes the most important document they possess and is cherished as the ultimate authority for the communities' religious beliefs. Given enough time teachings and interpretations concerning the communities' "received revelations" will accumulate around one's canon. It is from these interpretations and teachings that the community will gradually build and produce its "Religious Belief System." This simple process is best explained as follows:

1. **God gives man a revelation.**
2. **Men record the revelation and canonize the revelation and it become their "Bible".**
3. **The canon becomes the authority for the Religious Belief System of the community.**
4. **The Religious Belief System becomes the "Standard" of measurement for all other religious data, information & practice of the religion of the community.**
5. **The canon becomes the authority to judge & correct all other canons & all other religious beliefs (regardless of whether it is right or wrong).**

WHO DECIDES WHAT IS CONSIDERED TO BE ACCEPTED OR

REJECTED IN SELECTION OF A CANON (OUR BIBLES)?

This newly formed Religious Belief System (as seen in our canons and Bibles) quickly becomes the standard which will be used exclusively to test and evaluate all other religious beliefs. If statements agree with the "Standard" they are considered correct and true. If they conflict or disagree with the "Standard" they are considered incorrect and false.

There is only one major problem: Who determines the "Standard?"

Unfortunately since the death and resurrection of Jesus the Catholic Church has for the most part determined the "Standard" to be used in evaluating revelation, both past and present. Little consideration has given to Jesus, his faith, his religion, and his teachings as the "Standard." Few seem to realize that he is the "Standard" and his Religious Belief System (his teachings and his interpretations which happen to be Jewish) make for the correct canon and Bible, both yesterday, today, and forever!

You can easily see that such a "Standard" becomes a potential source of enormous power for those who control it (organized religions). Such "Standards" have been used by priests, preachers, ministers, translators, evangelists, rabbis, etc., to control and manipulate people to do their (the organization's) bidding and not God's.

WHY NOT MAKE OUR OWN CANON-EVERYBODY ELSE DID!

Often such "Standards" are challenged in one or more of the following methods:

- Reinterpretation of the words in the Canon into other meanings which change the revelation.
- Often words are added or deleted from the Canon. This changes the whole meaning.
- Often one will come up with a "new revelation" to correct a prior revelation.
- The physical destruction of the competitive canon.
- Often we see a combination of the above four.

History will give the details concerning how the above four methods of challenging and eventually replacing the canon (the previous authoritative Religious Belief System of the Jewish Church). It would be this Jewish Messianic Belief System which served as the foundation for the new move of God at Pentecost (Festival of Shavuot) as God began to bring all men together in one body through His Messiah. TRAGICALLY, this Jewish Religious Belief System for both Jew and Gentile would, in the span of three hundred years, be completely replaced with a totally Gentile, Hellenized (Greek influenced) replacement faith which would serve as the new Religious Belief System which would serve as the replacement foundation for the Church of Yeshua and does so even up until today.

LET US BE REAL FOR A MINUTE:

One major question I challenge you to answer: "how did a movement within Second Temple Judaism, that began as a Jewish revival, anticipating the coming of it's long-awaited Jewish Messiah, evolve into the majority of the churches we see today that carries the Messiah's name, yet opposes most of what the historical Messiah taught and modeled? How did this Jewish renewal movement within Sinai faith of the first century become as we see it today: a anti-Semetic, anti-Judaic, Law-replacing, Festival-ceasing, Sabbath-changing, money-hungry movement that denies with impunity its responsibility to practice the tithe correctly, thus robbing God repeatedly week after week in Yeshua's name by neglecting and teaching incorrectly concerning one's responsibilities to the widows, orphans, strangers, the sick, lame and blind? How has the Christian church,

which is grafted into "Israel," become a wild olive branch that has detached itself from the root and fatness of the olive tree, and has, for the most part, replaced the "faith of Jesus" by a "faith about" Jesus" which has tragically bent upon destroying Judaism and abolishing totally the practice of the religion of Judaism? The answers can be found in researching the Canon of Scripture. Let us continue.

A QUICK LOOK AT LUTHER AND HOW HE USED THESE PRINCIPLES TO FURTHER RE-CREATE A REPLACEMENT RELIGION:

As stated previously, as God revealed Himself to men, it became necessary to write down these revelations which later became canonized into an authoritative documents for a community of people. The Bible is a book that contains a number of different recorded revelations about God. Religious leaders, both in Judaism and Christianity rely upon their "Canon" as proof for their authority. Over time challenges have been brought against different groups in authority through different methods:

- **Production of new revelations.**
- **Changing of the words of an existing revelation.**
- **Reinterpretation of existing words and revelations.**
- **Physical destruction of existing revelations.**
- **A combination of one or more of the above factors.**

By the time of John the Apostle's death (at the turn of the first century), the leadership of the Messianic church within Judaism (originally a Jewish congregation birthed at Hag Shavuot or the Festival of Pentecost) had shifted from Jews to Gentiles who were ignorant of the Jewish language, history, culture and mind set. The reason for this change was primarily related to the destruction of the Temple in 70 A.D. and the dispersion of the Jewish people into all the world. The first challenge to this new Messianic Community was through the changing of existing revelations with reinterpretation of the words within that revelation. The written authority that was originally used by these Gentile church leaders was the Septuagint, a Greek translation of the Hebrew Bible, not the Hebrew Bible itself. Remember, we have a translation, not the original manuscripts. As Gentiles read the Greek Bible numerous questions arose since they had not the background or tradition in this Jewish faith necessary to properly interpret what they were reading. With questions came answers, some correct and many incorrect as supplied by Gentiles, and not Jews, as they challenged the authority of the Jerusalem church as well as the Jewish Bible, from which their Green Scriptures had come. Let me say that in translation from Hebrew to Greek, it would be wonderful if every Hebrew word has an "EXACT EQUIVALENT" in the Greek language, but that is not the case. As a result, a variety of interpretations arose that only further aggravated tensions between Jewish interpretation and Gentile-Greek interpretations. Conflicting positions escalated between the two camps as the Gentile Church drew further away from its Jewish roots..

With the advent of Marcion and his Bible (the first New Testament), new revelations were offered by Marcion to replace the "old Jewish revelations". Marcion decided to throw away the Old Testament which was Yeshua's Bible. Can you believe it? Marcion is credited with producing the first "New Testament" and forced the Roman Church leaders to create their own "New Testament" to counteract that of Marcion and wrestle this "NEW AUTHORITY" away from Marcion and transplant it into their own theological camp. These "proto-Catholics" simply built on the foundation of Marcion's Bible to create their own authority to sanction their efforts of spreading their own kind of interpretations of the religion of Yeshua, regardless if it was right or wrong.

Marcion produced his new canon in 140 A.D. which is almost 100 years after Yeshua. This was 80 years after Paul and 40-50 years after John the Apostle's death. Marcion was forced to create a "New Bible," thereby replacing the authority of the "Old" Testament to allow emerging Gentile church

leaders to justify their position as God's "new" appointed leaders as they felt that they had "replaced" Israel in God's economy.

I can understand the these early Gentile feelings, since Israel had been dispersed into captivity, and the physical nation no longer survived, but what of today when Israel has been re-established by Yahweh in 1948? How can the Christian Church claim, in the face of the momentous events of the last generation, that they are still the "replacement" for Israel, and God is no longer working through Israel?

The tragic error of Marcion and these first century Gentiles is that they failed to realize that God's covenant with Israel and the Jewish people is forever! The Gentile Church's agenda, in the wake of the exile and dispersion of the Jews in the first century, was to switch the authority of the "Mother Church" from Jerusalem to Athens-Rome. To do this, they needed an "authority" which gave them the "right" to proceed with the transfer of power. Marcion had already provided his "new revelation," so why not them as well? They found such authority in a new "Canon."

With the Roman response to Marcion which included writings very similar to those found in the New Testament of today, came also the prerogative to include or exclude certain books as each community decided. The debate over which books should be included or excluded in the Roman Catholic Canon extended from 150 to 380 A.D. Although the Catholic Canon was closed in 380 A.D. the debate over many books continued for almost one thousand years, in fact, the debate over inclusion or rejection of the Book of Revelation continued until well into the 10th century!

It would be 55 more years before Emperor Constantine (a self-professed God, himself an idolator) would wrestle the control of Christianity from the grip of the local independent church leaders. They became totally subject to the Emperor's decisions in the matters of religion after the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. Relying upon "personal revelation" from either the God of Israel or the sun god, Constantine blended Mithraism (pagan worship) with Judaism and further the Gentile expression of the religion of Yeshua. Thus, he further laid the foundations that perpetuated Christianity for what it has become today. As recorded earlier, one of the ways of challenging existing religious authority is through a "new revelation". It was through such "new revelation" that Constantine:

- **Created a new powerful group to rule the Church.**
- **Used public taxes to fund this group.**
- **Gave this group judicial powers.**
- **Divided the new group into smaller units which he could easily control.**
- **Changed the Passover to Easter (Ish-tar; "a pagan holy day for fertility and fornication rites").**
- **Changed the Sabbath (both the Jewish & the early church's day of worship) to Sunday (sun worshiper's day for worship)**
- **Prohibited the Church from having anything to do with Jewish ways or customs.**
- **Prohibited Jews from making proselytes (converts).**

Constantine failed to remember the same thing that plagues the churches of today: Yeshua (Yeshua), Paul, Peter, Jacob (James), John, etc. were all Jews. They all kept the Passover and worshipped on the Jewish Sabbath. It would have been a sin for Yeshua to participate in an Ish-tar fertility rite or worship at a sun-rise service on the day of the Sun g-d. Yeshua and his Apostles were Jews who never renounced their Judaism, neither gave up their Jewish observances or told other Jews to renounce their Judaism in order to become members of a "new Christian Church." We must not forget that these are the same teaching that were shared with Gentiles who came to faith in Yeshua in obedience of the Great Commission up until the fourth century. Unfortunately this Roman Emperor authority model became the model followed by the Roman Catholic church. Eventually the Roman Empire along with its Emperor who would become the head of the church would disappear but only to be replaced again with one man who controlled the church, the Pope. The Roman model of authority prevailed against every major attack until the arrival of Martin Luther and a new model of authority; subjectivism.

The decision of Martin Luther to reform the Roman Catholic Church was never intended to end in the further creation of a new religion. He liked being a Catholic priest, practiced and taught Catholic doctrines, and actively participated in the Catholic Church. He accepted the Catholic doctrine of salvation and never suggested that there was another way of salvation. Luther chose to continue his reform activities against the purchasing of indulgences (prayers for the dead), trying to guarantee that more money would be left in his parish, and soon found himself excommunicated for his efforts. For a Catholic this is serious because being kicked out of the Roman Church meant he was no longer "saved" as "salvation is only in the church." For Luther to regain his salvation he had to successfully challenge the authority of the Church. He had to overcome:

- The absolute power of the Pope.
- Salvation based upon membership in the Catholic Church only.
- The Catholic priesthood's power to forgive sins.
- The Catholic priesthood's power to interpret the Bible.
- The doctrine of Apostolic succession.

Acknowledging that challenges to existing religious authority is always linked to "new" revelations, Luther challenged the Roman Church with his "new" revelation. The following is a summary of Luther's "new revelation."

- The authority of the Bible replaces the authority of the Pope.
- Salvation is based upon only the faith of the believer.

READ MATTHEW 19:16-21 & JAMES 2:14-26...IT DOES NOT SAY THAT

- 3. He developed the doctrine of the priesthood of the believer to replace the priesthood of the Roman Church. Each believer could go directly to God for the forgiveness of sins.
- 4. Each believers could interpret the Bible for himself (it did not matter if you were trained to educated at all).

THIS EXPLAINS WHY WE HAVE OVER 2000 DIFFERENT PROTESTANT DENOMINATIONS ALONE...WITH 2000 DIFFERENT YESHUAS. WHO HAS THE FAITH ONCE GIVEN TO THE SAINTS? WHERE IS THE ONE FAITH OF EPHESIANS 4:5?

- 5. Apostolic succession (authority handed down from Yeshua to Apostles to the papacy) was replaced with the authority of the indwelling Holy Spirit in each believer. Because of the presence of the Holy Spirit in each believer, they could interpret the Bible for himself and the Holy Spirit would guarantee that the would never make an error. (what a joke)!

JESUS TEACHES US THAT THE PHARISEES SET IN MOSES SEAT (GOD'S SEAT OF AUTHORITY). PAUL TEACHES US THAT WE MUST STUDY TO SHOW OURSELVES APPROVED UNTO GOD, A WORKMAN THAT NEEDETH NOT TO BE ASHAMED, RIGHTLY DIVIDING THE WORD OF TRUTH (1 TIM. 2:15).

LUTHER'S TEACHINGS BROUGHT DEVASTATING EFFECTS TO

THE CHURCH:

Multitudes quickly became self-appointed authorities themselves, with little preparation and without accountability to the Bible Yeshua used. It mattered little to them if their Bible was correctly interpreted: linguistically, historically, culturally, and politically. Thus, multitudes continued to "wrongly divide the Word of Truth."

THE RESULTS...SOME GOOD...MOST BAD

- **Now everyone was his own ultimate authority.**
- **Faith alone was a requirement for salvation.**
- **The individual could go directly to God for forgiveness.**
- **Each could adequately interpret the Bible without any prior knowledge necessary for proper interpretation.**
- **The authority you needed to all of the above was resident in the Holy Spirit.**

Thus, the foundation for great Biblical error and disobedience to God was perpetuated in the Protestant Reformation as individuals protested against the Roman Catholic Church and began to break away with themselves self-appointed authorities, basically ignorant of the Bible, except that they had a faith in God.. Next came an immediate exodus from the Catholic Church to Luther's Church. But, it was not very long before Luther's disciples began to use their new found "individual freedoms and personal authority to challenge Luther. Before long there were two Protestant Churches, then 3,5,50,100, and we have 1500 today!

Answer for yourself: What happened to the faith and religion of Yeshua that provided for widows, orphans, obeyed the Sabbath, kept the Festivals, and taught Gentiles to do likewise for four centuries? By now, you can see how replacement "revelations" have taken the place of the faith of Yeshua, and these "replacement revelations" were canonized and became the Bibles we carry today. Let us return to the study of the Canon.

More to follow in next article. Shalom.



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #3

DID JESUS COME TO ABOLISH THE LAW AND GIVE US A NEW BIBLE?

As we look at Yeshua's canon (Bible), we must examine its foundation first through the study of history, culture, & language. Yeshua did not intend to create a new religion. Yet we have one. In fact, we have thousands of different sects all claiming "authority" by his name.

Let us examine undeniable facts that will go a long way in proving this point:

- Yeshua was Jewish from the day he was born until his last day upon the earth.
- Yeshua was a Jewish Rabbi (teacher).
- Yeshua's canon was the Jewish canon (Tanakh: Law-Prophets-Writings plus the Oral Law).
- Yeshua never renounced his Judaism or joined or created another religion. To have done so would have been the greatest of sins.
- Yeshua was not a Christian.
- Yeshua adhered to the Festivals of the Lord.
- Yeshua adhered to the Biblical Sabbath (Saturday).
- Yeshua's Apostles were Jews and never renounced their Judaism.
- Yeshua's Apostles required Gentiles to adhere to many Jewish laws (the laws of Noah-Acts 15).
- The canon of the Apostles was the same canon that Yeshua used.
- The Apostles did not see the need to make any changes in the Jewish canon after Yeshua's death.

CANONS, CANONS EVERYWHERE, WHICH ONE IS CORRECT?

Today we have three canons or Bibles that are in existence: Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant. Each Bible consists of a group of books, which have been selected as authoritative by "the powers that be". The books that are found in Bibles, whether Jewish, Catholic, or Protestant, all fall into 3 basic categories:

- Jewish books canonized by those with Jewish authority.
- Jewish books canonized by those with Catholic authority.
- Jewish books canonized by those with Protestant authority.

From this you can quickly see that there are three levels of authority to be recognized today: Jewish, Catholic, and Protestant.

Answer for yourself: Which does God stand behind? Does He condone all three?

Answer for yourself: If God intended three authorities, how do we account for the differences, conflicts, and contradictions that exist when compared against themselves?

Answer for yourself: Which is correct and which is in error? Is God schizophrenic?

Answer for yourself: If God is the same yesterday, today, and tomorrow; then why can't He make up His mind and have all three authorities agree?

THE FIRST CANON-G-D'S GRACIOUS GIFT TO MANKIND-THE LEGACY OF SINAI LIVES:

The Jewish canon has existed for over 1900 years. This is the Bible Yeshua used! It is called the "Tanakh" and consists of three major groups which consist of 39 books.

The canon, or officially accepted list of books in the **Hebrew Bible**, consists of 24 books according to Jewish reckoning and is divided into three parts: the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. The Law (Torah), often called the Pentateuch, comprises five books, GENESIS through DEUTERONOMY. The Prophets (Nevi'im) are divided into three parts: the earlier prophets (Joshua, JUDGES, 1 and 2 SAMUEL, and 1 and 2 KINGS); the later prophets (ISAIAH, Jeremiah, and EZEKIEL); and twelve books called the Minor Prophets because of their brevity. The 11 Writings (Ketuvim) include three poetic books (PSALMS, PROVERBS, and Job); the five scrolls (SONG OF SOLOMON, RUTH, LAMENTATIONS, Ecclesiastes, and ESTHER); an apocalyptic work, DANIEL; and EZRA-NEHEMIAH and 1 and 2 CHRONICLES.

Christian Bibles arrange the books differently. The Law, or Pentateuch, comes first, then all the historical books. These are followed by the poetical, or wisdom, books and finally the prophetic books. Thus Ruth, Chronicles, Ezra, Nehemiah, and Esther appear in the second group and Daniel and Lamentations in the fourth.

The Jews never ceased writing religious books. Several books composed in Hebrew or Greek after 300 BC are part of **the SEPTUAGINT (LXX), or Old Greek versions, and were regarded as Scripture by many Christians.** Roman Catholics and the Orthodox include these books, called APOCRYPHA or Deuterocanonical books, in the Bible. Protestants omit them or print them as an appendix to the Bible.

THE JEWISH CANON-THE BIBLE JESUS USED:

Torah: (Law):

Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy.

Nevi'im (Prophets):

Joshua, Judges, I & II Samuel, I & II Kings, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zachariah, and Malachi.

Ketuvim (Writings):

Psalms, Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Song of Solomon, Ecclesiastes, Lamentations, Esther, Daniel, Nehemiah, and I & II Chronicles.

It is important to note that the Jewish Religious Belief System gives different levels of authority to each of these three divisions. **The Torah is the most authoritative**, followed by the Nevi'im (Prophets) which are followed by the Ketuvim (Writings). Whenever there are two possible courses of action for a particular situation and one

is found in the Torah and the other in one of the lesser two divisions, the one in the Torah is considered as the most authoritative. The Torah is the focus of the Tanakh (The Jewish Bible).

COMPETITION OVER CANONS BEGIN-MARCION'S BIBLE- 140 C.E.:

Marcion is the first person known to us who published a fixed collection of what we would call New Testament books. Others may have done so before him; if so, we have no knowledge of them. As stated before, he rejected the Old Testament totally, as having no relevance or authority for Christians; his collection was therefore designed to be the "first Bible". I wonder what Yeshua thought of Marcion's endeavors since Marcion threw out the Bible Yeshua (Yeshua) used.

It is amazing that before Marcion we find no evidence of the "church" using or even having a need for any writings other than the Jewish Bible of Yeshua! Think about that for a minute. Before Marcion, no apostle or disciple of Yeshua even considered making a new canon!

The Messianic community did not have a need for a new canon for over 110 years.

Answer for yourself: How did they manage? How is it that Yeshua would send them into all the world and command them to teach mankind to observe those things he commanded without a "New Canon" to teach from?

CANON WARS BEGIN:

To counteract the authority of Marcion and his canon the proto-Catholic Church (in its infancy) responded with a canon of their own to validate their own Religious Belief System and refute Marcion's Religious Belief System. The Catholic Canon consisted of two major divisions which contain 75 books instead of the original 39 of Yeshua's Bible. Notice very carefully that those who were in charge of creating the Catholic canon chose to alter the Bible of Yeshua:

- 1) They destroyed the primary authority of the Torah by lumping all the books of Yeshua's Bible into one group which was given the title of "Old Testament", thus signifying that God was giving something to replace the "status quo" with something "new".
- 2) They rearranged the order of the books of Yeshua's Bible.
- 3) They added nine new books to the books of Yeshua's Bible: Tobit, Judith, I & II Maccabees, The Book of Wisdom, Ecclesiasticus, Baruch, Susanna, & Bel and the Dragon.
- 4) As stated before they renamed Yeshua's Bible "The Old Testament".
- 5) They created an entirely new division of canonical books which they called "The New Testament"; conveniently replacing the Bible Yeshua used with the Bible the Popes used.

WHO IS RESPONSIBLE FOR CHANGING THE AUTHORITY AND RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEM OF JESUS? WHO CHANGED HIS CANON? HOW DARE THEM ADD TO OR TAKE AWAY FROM THE WORD OF GOD---THE TANAKH?

Ask yourself these questions:

- **Who gave them (the Roman Catholic Church) the right to decide what books should be added**

to Yeshua's Bible?

- Who benefited from making such changes to Yeshua's Bible..Israel or Rome, the Jew or the Gentile?
- Who decided which books were to be added or deleted?
- What was the criteria used to evaluate adding or subtracting books from the Bible Yeshua used?
- What was the religious Belief System of those who added or subtracted books from the Yeshua's Bible?
- Was their Religious Belief System the same as Yeshua's?

If it was, then what was the need for a new Bible when Paul would say in 2 Tim 3:14-15: But continue thou in the things which thou hast learned and hast been assured of, knowing of whom thou hast learned them....and that from a child thou hast known the holy scriptures (WHAT SCRIPTURES?....THE Old Testament...the Bible Yeshua used), which are able to make thee wise

UNTO SALVATION THROUGH FAITH WHICH IS IN CHRIST JESUS."

- Why was there a need for new books anyway? After all, the Great Commission was fulfilled and the whole world heard the "Word" when using only Yeshua's Bible (The Old Testament).
- Could Yeshua's disciples adequately preach "salvation" to the world using Yeshua's Bible? Well, they did!
- Why was it necessary to rename Yeshua's Bible the "Old" Bible? Why call the additional books the "New" Bible?
- What was the rationale behind forming a new canon?
- Ask yourself why there was a need for Marcion or the Roman Catholic Church to create a new canon if salvation was being taken to the Gentile nations in fulfillment of the Great Commission by using the Bible of Yeshua: Law, Prophets, Writings?

LET US NOT FORGET: Remember a canon gives a group authority for their revelations and sanctions whatever they wish to do. How else could you "replace" something with something else unless you had the "new" authority to do so?

WHERE DID THEY GET THE AUTHORITY TO CHANGE THE REVELATION AND THE BIBLE?

Answer for yourself: And what gave them the authority?

You guessed it, a NEW REVELATION. It would be this "new revelation", based upon the "old" revelation, that would be added to, deleted, changed, & reinterpreted into the replacement canon of the Catholic Church which would give them power and authority to replace the religion of Yeshua with the religion of Jeroboam (Gentile religions which oppose God). It is this religion of Jeroboam which has come down to us today as a mixture of Gentile Paganism and Judaism. Literally it is contemporary "calf-worship" and we worship what we know not most often (John 4-the Samaritan woman at the well was half Gentile and half Jew, with a faith that was mixed between Gentile paganism and Judaism).

TELL IT LIKE IT IS:

Yeshua most assuredly taught that the Jewish Bible was his Bible and that the words of that Bible should not be changed (Matt. 5:17). Read it for yourself!

From the time of Yeshua's crucifixion, around 33 C.E. (A.D.), through the lifetime of the last Apostle (John in 96 C.E.), Yeshua's followers and disciples continued to use the Jewish Bible as their canon. This continued for another 44 years until approximately until 140 C.E. when Marcion set about to set in motion the stirrings for replacing the religion of Yeshua with the religion of Gentiles. Marcion desired to undo the work of Paul by divorcing the emerging Gentile Church (proto-Roman Catholic Church) from second Temple Judaism (the religion of Yeshua).

Think for a moment, it was the Roman Catholic Church that should be built upon the teachings of Yeshua the Jew (church is to be built upon the foundation of the Apostles and prophets-not Popes and Cardinals), not replacing Yeshua's foundations of Moses and Judaism with Gentile paganism that mixes in false religious teachings. Marcion's attempt to replace Yeshua's religion was the first known attempt of the proto-Roman Catholic Church as a fully Gentile institution to create a canon to replace the Jewish Bible & the Jewish Church.

This new canon of Marcion, as stated above, eliminated all of Yeshua's Bible! Marcion's canon included only Paul's epistles and selected portions of Luke's Gospel. Marcion was in the middle of a grown anti-Jewish movement which was sweeping through the Roman Empire in the second century. It would be this aberration which the Roman Catholic Church would build their "replacement Canon" upon.

Although the Gentile Roman Catholic Church rejected Marcion's canon, they quickly adopted his idea. Soon they decided to draft their own canon (Bible) to help support and give authority to their further diverging theological persuasions and further cause the separation of their Gentile organization from its Jewish Roots and the religion of Yeshua. If they were to stand apart and claim validity as a replacement faith and avoid the persecutions coming upon their Jewish brothers by Rome, then they had to show they had the authority to do so, and what could be better authority for such a "revelation" but a new canon. Around 180 C.E., forty years after Marcion and 150 years after Yeshua we see the emergence of a new canon for the Gentile Roman Catholic Church. Gentile replacement religion was off and running!

IS IT IN OR IS IT OUT?

Thus began an ongoing struggle that would last over 1000 years over which books should be included in the new Catholic Canon. There were at least 19 additional writings that the Roman Catholic leadership refused to include. Thomas was one of the original 12 Apostles whose Gospel of Thomas was accepted as Canon at first, only to later be rejected by others. A book entitled Third Corinthians appeared in an early Armenian canon. By the year 200 C.E. numerous new canons were in use. Some were fairly well defined, while others were much more informal. What we find upon examination is that each canon which was accepted in different regions reflected local beliefs and traditions unique to that region. Different canons reflected different beliefs in other areas. Thus we find great diversity. What does this have to say for inspiration in the gathering of a universal canon as given by God in the New Testament? Simply, inspiration in gathering the canon was non-existent!

EVERY MAN DID WHAT WAS RIGHT IN HIS OWN EYES & CLAIMED AUTHORITY FOR IT:

The many variations in canons produced very erratic religious practices and inconsistencies. The Roman Catholic leaders felt they had better quickly take action concerning such diversity if they were every to have uniformity. They quickly went to work to decide and identify which writings were "sacred or inspired." This confusion and chaos continued in Christianity for over 300 years. **Finally, the official canon of the Roman Catholic Church was agreed upon in 380 C.E., over 240 years after Marcion and 350 years after Yeshua.**

Stop & think about this for a moment. It was 350 years after the death of Yeshua before the need arose for a new revelation to replace the revelation given to men by God at Sinai and confirmed by His prophets! Wow! Even after the Catholic Canon was officially closed, new writings continued to appear. The last two books to be admitted to the Catholic Canon were Hebrews and Revelation. The debate over inclusion of Revelation lasted over 600 years.

Answer for yourself: What was the Holy Spirit's role in the selection, addition, deletions, and re-additions of these books to the accepted canon?

Conveniently, the newly created Catholic Canon provided the authority to the Catholic Church to propagate their anti-Yeshua & anti-Jewish doctrines and dogmas. The power of the Roman government gave the Roman Church the power to deal with those who opposed them. At last the embarrassment could stop; there was a single Catholic Canon and it would remain the sole authority for the next 700 years. Important questions should be asked:

- **Answer for yourself:** Where was God's leadership during all these years?
- **Answer for yourself:** Why didn't God protect the canonization of His Word in the New Testament?
- **Answer for yourself:** Where was the inspiration of the Holy Spirit in selecting books, deleting books, and re-including books hundreds of years later? Why the conflicts? Doesn't God know what He wants to do?
- **Answer for yourself:** What about the people who lived and died during these times? Are they "saved" even though they did not have an "official" New Testament?
- **Answer for yourself:** Were believers deprived of the Word of God by organized religion during those years because some books were not accepted until after they died?
- **Answer for yourself:** Were believers not only deprived of important revelations from God by self-appointed Gentiles since certain books were excluded and not included to the church's canon during their lifetimes.
- **Answer for yourself:** Were believers given the word of men instead of the word of God and lead astray in their worship of God as they followed a canon given to them by Roman Catholic Theology which believed in purgatory, infant baptism for salvation, the mediatorship of the Virgin Mary, Papal infallibility, prayers to the dead, etc.?
- **Answer for yourself:** What happened to the religion God gave the Gentile through Yeshua if we no longer use his Bible?
- **Answer for yourself:** How close to the "faith once given to the saints" is your religious beliefs or the religious beliefs of your church?
- **Answer for yourself:** Whose Religious Belief System do we have today in our churches? A Jewish or Gentile belief system? Which do you honestly believe Yeshua would follow today? Then why don't you?

IN A NUTSHELL:

The anti-Jewish Roman Catholic Church had achieved its goal; it established itself as "The Absolute Authority" over a Jewish movement whose origins, canon, and beliefs were Hebraic. Idolatrous Gentiles now interpreted for all men a "Jewish Religious Belief System". The long awaited and prophesied Jewish Messianic Movement had now become a Gentile replacement faith based on a mixture of truth and lies (see John 4 for a mixture religion and notice the response toward it by Yeshua). The Jewish Messianic Movement of Yeshua was totally recreated into a new Catholic

Religious Belief System that was, and still is, in direct opposition to the original Jewish Belief System of Yeshua.

Just because you are a Protestant or non-denominational believer you have no right to feel comfortable and insulated from such a tragedy, because we are nothing more than quasi-Catholics ourselves. Unknowingly, you have adopted the Roman Catholic replacement Bible as well as their modified Religious Belief System which is a false religious system in our day. How did we get here? There is nothing new under the sun. Let's reiterate:

- **1) The Roman Catholic Church "reinterpreted" the words of the canon/Jewish Bible of Yeshua, twisting meanings to give validity to their errors.**
- **2) They added words to and removed words from the canon/Jewish Bible of Yeshua, thus altering, changing, and removing Biblical doctrines at will if they were opposed to them, or desired they say something different.**
- **3) They rearranged the books of the canon/Jewish Bible of Yeshua, to give the false idea that God was replacing Judaism and the religion of Yeshua with a new Gentile faith.**
- **4) They declared that their "new revelation" nullified Yeshua's canon/Jewish Bible, thus doing away with the Old Testament as an authority.**
- **5) They added their "new revelation" to Yeshua's canon/Jewish Bible.**

More to follow in next article.



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #4

TIMELINE-TRACING THE CANON-DEVELOPMENT OF THE BIBLE:

EARLY DEVELOPMENT

- 1400-400 B.C. Books of the Hebrew Old Testament written (rewritten by Ezra and his scribes following the return from Babylonian and Persian captivity)
- 250-200 B.C. The Septuagint, a popular Greek translation of the Old Testament, produced
- A.D. 45-85? Books of the Greek New Testament written 90 and 180 and following. Councils of Jamnia give final affirmation to the Old Testament canon (39 books)
- 140-150 Marcion's heretical "New Testament" incites orthodox Christians to establish a NT canon
- 303-306 Diocletian's persecution includes confiscating and destroying New Testament Scriptures
- 305-310 Lucian of Antioch's Greek New Testament text; becomes a foundation for later Bibles
- 367 Athanasius's Festal Letter lists complete New Testament canon (27 books) for the first time
- 397 Council of Carthage establishes orthodox New Testament canon (27 books)
- 400 Jerome translates the Bible into Latin; this "Vulgate" becomes standard of medieval church

ENGLISH VERSIONS FROM LATIN

- 650 Caedmon, a monk, puts Bible books into verse
- 735 Historian Bede translates the Gospels
- 871-899 King Alfred the Great translates the Psalms and 10 Commandments 950 The 7th-century Lindisfarne Gospels receive English translation 955-1020 Aelfric translates various Bible books
- 1325 Both Richard Rolle and William Shoreham translate psalms into metrical verse
- 1300 Invention of eyeglasses aids copying
- 1380-1382 John Wycliffe and associates make first translation of the whole Bible into English
- 1388 John Purvey revises Wycliffe Bible
- 1455 Gutenberg's Latin Bible--first from press

ENGLISH VERSIONS FROM GREEK

- 516 Erasmus's Greek New Testament, forerunner to the Textus Receptus used by KJV

translators

- 1525 William Tyndale makes the first translation of the New Testament from Greek into English
- 1536 Tyndale strangled and burned
- 1537 Miles Coverdale's Bible completes Tyndale's work on the Old Testament
- 1538 Great Bible, assembled by John Rogers, the first English Bible authorized for public use
- 1560 Geneva Bible--the work of William Whittingham, a Protestant English exile in Geneva
- 1568 Bishop's Bible--a revision of the Great Bible
- 1582 Rheims New Testament published
- 1607-1611 King James Version, the "Authorized Version," is made by team of about 50 scholars

SUMMARY-HISTORY OF THE CANONIZATION OF THE BIBLE:

The canon of the Bible was the product of historic discernment on the part of various religious groups of which traditional writings were to be considered "inspired" by God as special revelation to man.

The Jewish Bible (Tanach): The Jewish Bible reached its current form in the 2nd Century BC but was not canonically closed until after the destruction of the Temple when the rabbinic groups meeting at Jamnia tried to piece together what was left of Judaism once the priests (Sadducees) were wiped out and the Temple irrevocably destroyed. They reconsidered the canonical status of several books including Esther, Song of Songs, 1&2 Chronicles, Ecclesiastes. They also explored the canonicity of Sirach and Wisdom of Solomon.

They ultimately used the following **criteria for canonicity of Jewish books:**

The book had to be:

- 1) written originally in Hebrew
- 2) written within the confines of Eretz Israel
- 3) the book must not contradict the Torah
- 4) the book must have been written before the time of Artaxerxes because afterwards the Pharisees believed there was "no clear succession of prophets." Conveniently, these criteria eliminated the Teacher of Righteousness (from Qumran), John the Baptist, and Yeshua as true prophets and rejected all the books of the NT.

The Christian Bible: **Gentile Christians formed their own scriptures gradually over the first 4 centuries.** By the 2nd Century, the Greek Translation of the Jewish OT (The Septuagint: LXX) with varying lists of Christian texts was the common Christian Bible. Contrary to earlier scholarship, it has been shown by A.C. Sundberg at Harvard that the Christian OT in the 2nd Century was not taken over from Alexandrian Judaism but was formed by the Christians themselves probably on reflection on the teachings of Christ on the Sermon on the Mount/Plain. The Christian OT was larger than the Jewish Bible because the Christians discerned for themselves the inspiration of what have been called the Deuterocanonical Books. It is erroneous to claim that St Athanasius determined the NT Canon, for he was just one scholar among many who had an opinion. **Actually, the local Council of Hippo in 393 AD represents the consensus of the Church on the Canon. This Canon was the long one later accepted at the Council of Trent in 1546 for the Catholic Church and include all the Books of scripture, not just the NT. The decision here was referred to the "Transmarine Church" (Rome) for final confirmation. The decision at Hippo was endorsed by the subsequent 3rd and 4th Councils of Carthage and the Council of Rome. This Canon became the standard until the Reformation.**

The protestant reformers rejected the traditional Christian Catholic Canon and eliminated the Deutero-canonical books because:

- **The Deutero. contained a large amount of wisdom material which seemed to emphasize "works righteousness" and allowed for such practices as prayers for the dead and the intercession of the saints**
- **The NT does not frankly quote the Deutero. as scripture even though allusions to the material are legion (esp. Sermon on Mt/Pi)**
- **There were no known Hebrew originals of the Deutero. at that time and so these books were not considered to be authentic OT in accordance with the humanist movement's "back to the sources" policy**

ORIGIN OF THE BIBLE & WHY WE DON'T HAVE THE ORIGINAL CANON OF JESUS TODAY:

For a full description of where the Bible came from, I would recommend a book called *Where We Got The Bible* by Henry Graham.

The facts of the matter are that by the time of Christ, the Jews outside Israel were using the LXX, the Greek version of the Scriptures, that included the seven books that were removed by Luther and the reformers.

Answer for yourself: The question that needs to be asked, is "When does the canon of the Old Testament end?" How would the Jews know?

Answer for yourself: If the Old Testament canon ends with the coming of Christ, then who has authority in the New Testament times to determine what the scriptures are?

Answer for yourself: Why do you assume that a New Testament "exists" that can be considered to be the "inspired word of God" as was the writings of Moses?

As we look at history, the facts of history, we see that the New Testament was determined at the Gentile Roman Catholic Church's councils of Hippo and Carthage during the 4th and 5th centuries as detailed above. It was these Gentile Catholic Church Councils who determined which of the books written during the Apostolic times were "inspired by God or not". These councils gave us the New Testament and confirmed the canon of the Old Testament, which has been reaffirmed through all the Catholic Councils and definitively again at the Council of Trent to refute the reformers.

Answer for yourself: Now for a big question. If you cannot accept nor condone the religious doctrines as taught by Roman Catholicism then are you aware that you accept their book...the New Testament? Have you ever really looked at the doctrines as taught by the Catholic Church and thought that these same people who were definitely "off" theologically were the same ones to give you your New Testament Scriptures...did the Holy Spirit give them this "book" but failed to straighten them out on their "religious" beliefs or have their religious beliefs crept into the pages of the New Testament and you not know it?

THE \$64,000 QUESTION:

Answer for yourself: The real question is: Who had authority delegated to them from Yeshua; the Rabbis, the Gentile Catholic Church or the Protestant Reformers? No where in the New Testament do we find authority delegated to Gentiles to decide the course for the faith. Let us never forget that Yeshua instructs us, even before he corrects some of the Pharisees, yet not all, that it is...

"THE PHARISEES THAT SET IN MOSES' SEAT." (Matt. 23:2...The

Scribes and the Pharisees sit in Moses' seat: ALL therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, observe and do;...).

Notice, he did not say that the Catholic Church or the Protestant reformers, or Greek proselytes sit in Moses' seat! The reason why the authority had to reside with Israel and the Jews is demonstrated in many Scriptures, even in the New Testament. Take for example, Rom. 9:3:

"Who are Israelites; to whom pertaineth the adoption, and the glory, and the covenants, and the giving of the Law, and the service (worship) of God, and the promises (covenants), whose are the fathers, and of whom as concerning the flesh Messiah came, WHO IS OVER ALL, .."

THINK....written after the cross!

It is very evident from this one Scripture alone, that Paul considered Israel as the one God chose to entrust His revelation with; not only that, but it would be Israel who would be OVER ALL other peoples as a "light" to direct their way to God. Since it was to Israel that the Law and covenants were given, who best able to teach and interpret such but a Jew, and not a Gentile. Let us not forget, in fact we are admonished to "remember" in Eph. 2:11-12 that ...

as Gentiles that we all were "in times past Gentiles in the flesh, who are called Uncircumcision by that which is called the Circumcision in the flesh made by hands; that at that time we were without Messiah, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

Now, let us be objective about this next question:

Answer for yourself: Does the above Biblical definition of a Gentile sound like it is someone Yeshua would put in charge of rightly dividing God's Word that had been handed down, protected, and cherished since the Garden, even Sinai?

Answer for yourself: How could such strangers to covenants, laws, and the religion of Israel be entrusted with making such important decisions without prior preparation? It is easy to see that such Gentiles lacked the "tools" of knowledge and understanding to rightly divide the Word of Truth; thus in Acts 15:21 we find James' admonition that Gentiles coming to the faith of Israel attend the Synagogue on Sabbaths where they will be instructed in "Moses," thereby learning those necessary things needed to properly live a life pleasing to God as well as coming to the knowledge of God which is necessary to correctly understand and interpret the Bible that existed in their day (a Hebrew Bible). Remember, they were pagans and Greeks without such backgrounds, ill equipped to render an authoritative decision about anything connected with Israel.

Now, another big question must be answered:

Answer for yourself: If such Gentiles were ill-equipped to become authorities of Israel's religion since they were so deficient in the traditions, customs, beliefs, covenants, laws, and manners concerning Israel's faith, they how you discount this and allow Gentiles to take over the faith of Yeshua following 70 A.D. when the Temple was destroyed and all Jewish authorities exiled from Israel?

Answer for yourself: What possible qualifications could they have possess that would allow them to "take-over" for the Rabbis who set in Moses's seat, after all, it had only been since 50 A.D. (only twenty years) that Gentiles had been given the faith of Yeshua? Let us understand, at the most, the training and competence of Gentile religious leaders in Israel could not be more than 20 years. This is unthinkable when compared to Biblical truths that had been handed down as well as lived four for thousands of years by the Jews!

Therefore, in the mouth of two witnesses (Yeshua and Paul) we confirm that the Jews were given the spiritual authority for all mankind, and not the Gentile! Yeshua said and meant: "Salvation is of the Jews."

This questions now become easier to answer. The Protestant Reformers did NOT have authority from Yeshua, neither did the Gentile Catholic Church to change, alter, replace, add to, or take away from the revelation of God "entrusted to holy men of old." Upon much study you will find, as I did, that nothing they did is consistent with divinely inspired inspiration that was given to Israel. The Gentile Catholic Church Councils could not agree over even what books were to be in the Bible; their doctrines have changed, and they did not even claim authority or inspiration from God to know what the true Bible was.

HOW THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH GUARANTEES THEIR AUTHORITY:

The Catholic Church ERRONEOUSLY BELIEVES that they were given authority by Yeshua in Matt. 16:16-20, when Yeshua supposedly established his Church upon the rock of Peter. This "office," as determined by the Catholic Church, is currently (erroneously I might add) believed to have given Peter the "headship" of the Church. The last time I looked at the Bible, the Messiah is head of the church, and not Peter. The Catholic Church's big mistake is when they considered Peter to be the first Pope, when all that Yeshua is doing, if anything, is reaffirming to the Jew-Peter that Yeshua's church and called out people will be built upon himself; the Messiah of God; the rock of God's revelation to mankind. What they fail to overlook, is that it was James, the Lord's brother, who was put in charge of the first Messianic Church in Jerusalem, and not Peter. If anyone was the "first Pope," it would be James and not Peter. The Church was founded by Yeshua, not by Constantine or the Roman Catholic Church, and anyone who believes this error simply does not know history. Constantine merely legalized Christianity in the Roman Empire.

WHY DON'T YOU ATTEND MASS IF YOU ACCEPT THEIR BIBLE?

Now the question you must ask yourself if you do not trust the authority of the Gentile Roman Catholic Church to determine for you the course of your spiritual life:

Answer for yourself:

- **"Why do you yet accept their Bible as Holy Scripture and reject the Bible of Yeshua as the sole authority of Scripture?**
- **Why do you trust a New Testament that is knowingly altered and changed by scholars and others who wish to inquire?**
- **You should ask yourself what other Scriptures possibly exist that are NOT in your Holy Bible that were considered inspired by the early church but removed by the Roman Catholic Church centuries ago?**
- **What part of Yeshua's Bible is no longer in your Bible today?**
- **Do you have the only "inspired" scriptures given to man by God?**
- **If you want to trust the authority of Luther (who never intended to break from the Catholic church), then where do you find corroboration for Luther's authority as opposed the Roman**

Catholic Church or the Rabbis for that matter?

- **Why did Yeshua wait 1500 years for Luther to begin his church the right way?**
- **Did the Apostles go out and do the Great Commission incorrectly?**
- **Why did Yeshua wait almost 400 years to provide his servants with a "New" testament and previously send them "into all the world" without the "official manual" for salvation?**
- **How does Luther know which books are scripture and which are not, especially when he is 1500 years separated from the time of Yeshua and the Apostles, and does not have the original manuscripts, or even any manuscripts of some of the writings of that time?**
- **What are we to make of Luther's dubious religious doctrine like saying that the book of James is the "book of the Devil?"**

Let us not forget that Yeshua appointed James the head of his church in this world. Surely Yeshua would not have appointed a "devil" to head and oversee his church!

Answer for yourself: Should we trust such men as the early Greek Gentile Church Fathers and Luther to determine for us what we are to believe in our churches today when a little study will reveal that they violated repeatedly the commandments in the Bible and the religion of Yeshua?

Sadly, some of the writings that the early Jewish and Jewish-Gentile church considered inspired and relied upon as their "authorities" were not deemed inspired by these Greek philosophical-religious scholars and were not preserved. Many of the books deemed "inspired" by the original Jewish church are today lost and not in the Bibles we carry.

Answer for yourself: Why not?

WHY OMISSIONS IN THE CANON:

I have one question that is playing greatly on my mind and it deals with those books that were written and not included in our Bibles.

Answer for yourself: Why were these books not chosen, and what criteria was used that caused their elimination from our Bibles today? Concerning those books which were chosen, why were they?

Answer for yourself: Who got to decide which books were chosen?

You are probably aware that the Catholic and Jewish Bibles have books that are not in the Christian Bible.

Answer for yourself: Which ones are they and why are these books excluded from the Christian Bible? To answer these questions, we must examine the Bible as well as the canonization process even more in depth than before. Let us first get an over-view of the development of our Bibles.

THE CANON WE NEVER GOT:

There are many books various early Christian churches considered as canonical, or as possible additions to the Testaments. In some churches a few of these DID make it into their Scriptures. Some of these may be known to you by other names, but these are the most generally used English translations of the titles. These are not the Apocrypha, but known as the **Pseudepigrapha** or other names. The word Pseudepigrapha, meaning "books with false titles," refers to books similar in type to those of the Bible whose authors gave them the names of persons of a much earlier period in order to enhance their authority. Among the best known are 3 and 4 Esdras and the Prayer of Manasseh.

The term "Pseudepigrapha" is applied to many Jewish and Jewish-Christian books written in the period 200 B.C. to 200 A.D. These Jewish books include Jubilees, Enoch, Psalms of Solomon, Assumption (or Testament) of

Moses, Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sibylline Oracles, and the Apocalypse of Baruch. Fragments of the Damascus Document have been found among the DEAD SEA SCROLLS.

Other Pseudepigrapha exist in Greek, Slavonic, and other languages, many of them revisions of Jewish books. These include the Apocalypse of Peter, the Shepherd of Hermas, and the Ascension of Isaiah. The Gospel of Thomas and the Protoevangelium of James contain many legends about Yeshua and Mary and show the influence of Gnosticism, as does the Apocalypse of Adam. The Gospel of Nicodemus is composed of the Acts of Pilate and the Harrowing of Hell. The Pseudepigrapha are important for the light they throw on Judaism and early Christianity. The Epistle of Jude, for example, reflects a knowledge of Enoch and the Assumption of Moses, and it found its way into our Bibles, but not without a struggle.

Many of these books are lost to us today and we only know of their names, however, many have been preserved and can be studied today as well. Remember, many were considered "Scripture" by the early believers in Yeshua (Yeshua).

HOW COME NO ONE TOLD ME ABOUT THESE BOOKS?

Because of their Jewishness, many, if not all in some circles, are considered as heretic by most Christian churches, but then so too are some of the most "popular" New Testament texts, by other Christian churches, like the Revelation of St John which only got included in the first place as a kind of horse trade between Eastern and Western divisions of the early Christian Catholics of various flavors at Nicene and Carthage. The point is that some Jewish-Christian church or another, before Rome took over, considered each of these as Scripture one time or another. The most Fundamentalist of Protestants love to condemn so much else of the Roman Catholic Church, yet they meekly Roman Catholic authority on what is, and what is not Canonical Scripture. Why?

It was Jerome, who putting the Catholic Latin Vulgate together, arbitrarily threw texts he didn't like into the Apocrypha, yet still keeping them in the Bible. They remained in the genuine "King James" Bibles until the American Bible Society chopped them out in the early 19th century (along with significant editing of the text--yet this is the one usually referred to as the "genuine" King James Version!). The Puritans and their kin had Special Editions of their Bibles created without these books in them, even before the 1611.

The information being presented to you should make you wonder what ELSE they didn't tell you in Sunday School and Bible Study!

WHAT WAS CONSIDERED INSPIRED THEN?

Let us examine many of the books that were considered "inspired" by those of the churches of the first several centuries.

Answer for yourself: You should ask yourself a question as you look over these books..."have I read any of these books before, and if not, why not since they were considered "canon" by the earliest believers?"

More to follow.



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #5

LISTING OF BOOKS NOT FOUND IN THE BIBLE TODAY..YET WAS CONSIDERED CANON BY OTHERS BEFORE:

- Abraham
- Acts of Adam
- Acts of John
- Acts of Paul
- Acts of Paul and Thecla
- Acts of Peter
- Acts of Solomon
- Ahigar
- Apocalypse of Adam
- Apocalypse of Barach (I)
- Apocalypse of Barach (II)
- Apocalypse of Daniel
- Apocalypse of Elijah
- Apocalypse of Enoch
- Apocalypse of Ezra (Esdras)
- Apocalypse of James (I)
- Apocalypse of James (II)
- Apocalypse of Peter
- Apocalypse of Philip
- Apocalypse of Stephan
- Apocalypse of Solomon
- Apocalypse of Thomas
- Apocalypse of Zephaniah
- Apocryphon of Ezekiel
- Apocryphon of John
- Apostles' Creed
- Ascension of Isaiah
- Assumption of Moses
- Baruch III
- Baruch IV
- Chronicles of the Kings of Israel
- Chronicles of the Kings of Judah
- Clement's First Letter (I Clement)

- **Clement's Second Letter (II Clement)**
- **Clement's Third Letter (III Clement)**
- **Dialogue of the Redeemer**
- **Didache (The Teachings of the Twelve Apostles)**
- **Eldad and Moadad**
- **Enoch, Book of**
- **Enoch II (Book of the Secrets of Enoch)**
- **Epistle of Barbabas**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Ephesians**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Magnesians**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Philadelphians**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Philippians**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Polycarp**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Romans**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Smyrns**
- **Epistle of Ignatius to the Trallians**
- **Epistle of Jeremy**
- **Epistle of Paul to the Laodiceans (2)**
- **Epistle of Pontius Pilate**
- **Epistles of Jesus Christ and Abgarus, King of Edessa**
- **Epistle to the Egyptians Ezra (Esdras) IV**
- **Faith and Wisdom (Pistis Sophia)**
- **Genesis Apocrypha**
- **Gospel of Nicodemus [Acts of Pilate, Christ's Descent into Hell]**
- **Gospel of Perfection**
- **Gospel of Philip**
- **Gospel of Peter**
- **Gospel of the Birth of Mary**
- **Gospel of the Ebionites**
- **Gospel of the Egyptians**
- **Gospel of the Hebrews**
- **Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ**
- **Gospel of Thomas**
- **Gospel of Truth**
- **History of Joseph**
- **History of the Rechabites**
- **Hodagot (Praises)**
- **Infancy Story of Jesus Christ of Thomas**
- **Jannes and Jambris**
- **Joseph and Aseneth**
- **Jashar**
- **Jubilees, Book of**
- **Kerygma of Peter**
- **Ladder of Jacob**
- **Letter of Aristeas to Philocrats**
- **(Pseudo-Aristeas)**
- **Letter of Herod to Pilate**
- **Letter of Paul to the Alexandrians**
- **Letter of Pilate to Herod**
- **Lives of the Prophets**
- **Lives of Adam and Eve (Apocalypse of Moses)**

- **Maccabee III**
- **Maccabee IV**
- **Manuals of Discipline, Benediction, and the Congregation**
- **Martyrdom of Isaiah**
- **Noah, Book of**
- **Odes (Odae)**
- **Odes of Solomon**
- **Paralipomena of Jeremiah**
- **Persarium**
- **Protevangelium of James**
- **Psalms of David (151-155)**
- **Psalms of Solomon**
- **Pseudo-Phocylides**
- **Prayer of Jacob**
- **Prayer of Joseph**
- **Prayer of Manasseh**
- **Questions of Ezra (Esdras)**
- **Report of Pilate the Governor**
- **Revelation of Ezra (Esdras)**
- **Revelation of Peter**
- **Shepard of Hermas**
- **Sibylline Oracles**
- **Syriac Merander**
- **Testament of Adam**
- **Testament of Isaac**
- **Testament of Jacob**
- **Testament of Job**
- **Testament of Moses**
- **Testament of Solomon**
- **Testament of the Lord**
- **Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs**
- **Treatise of Shem**
- **Vision of Ezra (Esdras)**
- **War of the Sons of Light Against the Sons of Darkness**
- **Wars of the Lord**
- **Wisdom of Jesus (Sophia Jesus Christ)**

THE OLD TESTAMENT-MAJOR THEMES & CHARACTERISTICS OF THE HEBREW CANON:

The Hebrew Bible, written over a period of more than 500 years, consists of many types of literature and reflects varying points of view. It is essentially religious, but, unlike most ancient religious books, the Old Testament is characterized by a strong sense of history; even laws and exhortations are woven into the narratives.

The themes are the uniqueness and glory of GOD (Yahweh), the COVENANTS He made with Israel, the Law, God's control of history and Israel's special destiny, God's revelation through the PROPHETS, the nature of humanity, corporate and individual sin and its remedy, and the true worship of God.

The Hebrews believed that their religion was founded on covenants that God offered them and that they had accepted. Yahweh had agreed to make them his specially chosen people and to protect them, but only if they

obeyed his Law. Covenants were made originally made with ADAM and NOAH (both Gentiles), which embraced all humankind, and with ABRAHAM (a Gentile) and his descendants; but the most important covenant was revealed to MOSES. Later, after the division of the JEWS into two kingdoms--JUDAH (south) and ISRAEL (north)--the people of Judah believed that a special covenant had also been made with King DAVID and his royal descendants.

Yahweh was different from all other deities. Israel was forbidden to worship any other god, and the Mosaic religion implied that no other existed, although this was not specifically emphasized until the time of the exile during the Babylonian Captivity (587-37 BC). Other gods personified natural forces or tribes and nations, but Yahweh was supreme over everything. Because he controlled history, he could use Assyria or Babylonia to punish a rebellious Israel. Plentiful crops depended on his will alone and NOT on the magical rites by which the Baals of Canaan were worshiped. The concept of the Book of LEVITICUS was that the Hebrews were to be a holy people, separated from all defilement.

Many laws in the Pentateuch, or TORAH, the first five books of Jesus' Bible, were not different from those of surrounding nations. However, some unique commandments were given, without specific rewards and punishments; most important were the TEN COMMANDMENTS, which have a high ethical content. The TORAH (Law) was a complete religious and civil law for the whole nation. It prescribed sacrifices and festivals similar to those of other nations, but the emphasis was on morality. Yahweh was a God of justice. All sin and injustice was an offense against him; and repentance could bring forgiveness.

In the Book of JOSHUA, Yahweh is a God of war who commands the slaughter of the Canaanites, but the Hebrew religion gradually outgrew such a concept, as can be seen in the books of JEREMIAH and JONAH. The prophets saw history as an interaction between the living God and his people, and its outcome depended on their obedience. Israel was destined to be a light to the nations, but it always had a special place in God's purpose and love, and the Hebrews always struggled with the two concepts of God's impartial justice and his love toward Israel. Late in the biblical period, writers of APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE, unlike the earlier prophets, despaired of the normal forces of history and believed that God would put an end to the present age, bringing in a miraculous reign of righteousness.

These themes were not systematized into a theology but can be discerned from the literature as a whole, which expresses the hopes, fears, laments, thanksgivings, and even the doubts of the Hebrews. Thus the Book of JOB criticizes the popular, facile doctrine of reward and punishment, and the Book of ECCLESIASTES often approaches skepticism.

DIVISION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT- CHRISTIAN BIBLE:

Pentateuch: Genesis recounts the creation of the universe and the first human beings, the traditions of the DELUGE, and the stories of the patriarchs down to the sojourn of the Hebrews in Egypt and the deaths of JACOB and JOSEPH. EXODUS tells how Moses led the people from Egypt and received the covenant and Law on Mount Sinai. Leviticus is largely a legal code; NUMBERS continues the story of migration toward the Promised Land. Deuteronomy partly repeats the narrative, recording other laws, and concludes with the death of Moses. It teaches a strict doctrine of corporate reward and punishment.

The Pentateuch is based on four principal sources. The oldest, J, was perhaps written in Judah, the southern kingdom, about 950 BC. Between 900 and 750, another version from Israel, the northern kingdom, was woven in; this is called EPHRAIM (E). In the 7th century BC, Deuteronomy, or most of it (D), was compiled. About 550 BC, during the exile, the final edition of the Torah added a priestly source (P), some parts of which are very old.

Historical Books: Joshua tells of a thorough conquest of Canaan, but Judges contains traditions of the Hebrew tribes in the period before the monarchy that reveal the conquest as partial. The books of Samuel are about the founding of the monarchy under SAUL and David and contain a magnificent early source for the life of David, probably written about 961-22 BC. All the above books have been extensively edited by writers who

shared the theology of the D source.

Ezra and Nehemiah were composed after the exile, when these two leaders restored Judaism in Palestine, and Nehemiah's own memoirs make up much of the latter book. The two Books of Chronicles cover Hebrew history from Ezra's priestly point of view but contain some valuable earlier traditions. Ruth is the story of a foreign woman who became loyal to Israel and was the ancestor of David. Esther is a tale of a Jewish queen of Persia who saved her people from persecution.

Poetical, or Wisdom, Books. Job contains some of the finest poetry in the Bible. Its themes are the problems of suffering and of man's standing before God. The Psalms were essentially composed for temple worship, although some may be pieces of individual devotion. Many are ascribed to David, but some come from an earlier period. Proverbs comprises several collections of ancient wisdom. Parts of Ecclesiastes are skeptical, but other sections express conventional wisdom. The Song of Solomon is a collection of love poems.

The Prophets: The great prophets of the 8th century BC were AMOS, HOSEA, Isaiah, and MICAH. They proclaimed God's holiness and his judgment on the idol worship and moral abuses of the Hebrew kingdoms, and called the people back to loyalty to the covenant. Jeremiah, the greatest prophet of the 7th century BC, was unique in recording his inner spiritual struggles and in promising a new covenant. Like Isaiah, he opposed military alliances with foreign nations and resistance to the Babylonian invasion. ZEPHANIAH and perhaps HABAKKUK belong to the same century. NAHUM gloats over the destruction (612 BC) of Nineveh. The most significant prophets during the period of Babylonian exile were the Ezekiel and the unknown authors of chapters 40-55 and 56-66 of Isaiah, who encouraged the return of the Jews to the Holy Land and promised a glorious national life. Lamentations reflects the miseries of the exile.

The remaining prophets followed the exile. OBADIAH is strongly nationalistic; JONAH expresses God's concern for Gentiles as well as Jews. HAGGAI and ZECHARIAH 1-8 reflect the rebuilding of a small temple in Jerusalem. JOEL, Zachariah 9-14, and MALACHI combine the themes of judgment and restoration and have apocalyptic elements. Daniel is an apocalypse from the Maccabean period (c.164 BC) and promises God's help to the Jews in time of persecution.

THE HEBREW-JEWISH BIBLE: CHART: 3 Divisions to the Hebrew Bible (the Bible Yeshua used)

Torah (Law):

- Genesis
- Exodus
- Leviticus
- Numbers
- Deuteronomy

Nevi'im (Prophets):

- Joshua
- Judges
- 1 Samuel
- 2 Samuel
- 1 Kings
- 2 Kings
- Isaiah
- Jeremiah
- Ezekiel
- Hosea

- Joel
- Amos
- Obadiah
- Jonah
- Micah
- Nahum
- Habakkuk
- Zephaniah
- Haggai
- Zechariah
- Malachi

Ketuvim (Writings):

- Psalms
- Nehemiah
- Proverbs
- Ruth
- Song of Solomon
- Ecclesiastes
- Lamentations
- Ester
- Daniel
- Ezra
- Nehemiah
- 1 Chronicles
- 2 Chronicles

VARIETY IN OLD TESTAMENT-CHRISTIAN BIBLES:

Having already looked at the division of the Hebrew Bible (Old Testament), let us look at different Christian Versions of the Old Testament. You may find this strange, but Christians and Jews still disagree over the content of the Old Testament. **The Protestant Old Testament is supposed to be identical to the Hebrew Bible, but it is NOT!; though the books are arranged and divided differently. In other websites I have devoted much space to the comparison of the Jewish Masoretic Text and the corruption of it's translation by the Essenes of Alexandria, Egypt, in 200 B.C.E. Of interest to the Christian is that these "purposeful corruptions of the Jewish texts" was done by the Essenes of Egypt in the 3rd century B.C. in order to validate their "unique theology" and give them a "Divine Book" whereby they now had, because of this Divine Book, a Divine authority for their religious beliefs over their adversaries and opponents. The Jews of Palestine never accepted this Greek translation because of its many inherent errors and this Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures incorporated pagan astral, cosmic, and sun-g-d beliefs among the Jewish Texts. Tragically this became the Scriptures for the Greek speaking world and ultimately became the Christian's Old Testament. To further complicate the matter every quote in the New Testament comes from these corrupted Greek texts.**

Answer for yourself: What does that mean for the Christian today?

Simply this; many, many religious beliefs and doctrines as taught in the Christian's Old Testament and it's corresponding quotes in the New Testament find their origin in pagan sun-worship and therefore many of the "beliefs" attached to Jesus are pagan and Jesus is made to have more in common with Osiris, Bacchus, Attis, Dionysus, etc., that with the Jewish Messiah of the Jewish Scriptures. Few know this until they study the corruption of the Jewish Bible. If you want to see this in detail you need to study: <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com> or

<http://www.bennoah1.freewebsites.com>.

Roman Catholics since 1546 (the Council of Trent) have officially included the "deutero-canonical" or "apocryphal" books. These books were included in early editions of the King James Bible, but Protestants have not considered them authoritative because they are not found in the Hebrew Bible.

HEBREW BIBLE-24 books

The Law:

- Genesis
- Exodus
- Leviticus
- Numbers
- Deuteronomy

The Prophets:

- Joshua
- Judges
- Samuel
- Kings
- Isaiah
- Jeremiah
- Ezekiel

Minor Prophets

The Writings:

- Psalms
- Proverbs
- Job
- Song of Solomon
- Ruth
- Lamentations
- Ecclesiastes
- Esther
- Daniel
- Ezra-Nehemiah
- Chronicles

PROTESTANT BIBLE-39 books

Law:

- Genesis
- Exodus
- Leviticus
- Numbers
- Deuteronomy

History:

- **Joshua**
- **Judges**
- **Ruth**
- **I & II Samuel**
- **I & II Kings**
- **I & II Chronicles**
- **Ezra**
- **Nehemiah**
- **Esther**

Poetry and Wisdom:

- **Job**
- **Psalms**
- **Proverbs**
- **Ecclesiastes**
- **Song of Solomon**

Prophecy:

- **Isaiah**
- **Jeremiah**
- **Lamentations**
- **Ezekiel**
- **Daniel**

The 12 Minor Prophets

ROMAN CATHOLIC BIBLE -46 books (The Protestant list, plus:)

- **Tobit**
- **Judith**
- **Wisdom of Solomon**
- **Ecclesiasticus (Sirach)**
- **Baruch (includes the Letter of Jeremiah) I & II Maccabees**
- **Additions to Daniel:**
- **Song of the Three Young Men**
- **Susanna**
- **Bel and the Dragon**
- **Additions to Esther**

more to follow



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #6

THE NEW TESTAMENT:

Major Themes and Characteristics

Covenant and law are central in the Old Testament, and JESUS CHRIST is central in the New Testament. The dominant theme is the interpretation of Yeshua's nature as CHRIST or MESSIAH (the anointed one), Son of man, Son of God, Lord (master, one in authority), and Prophet. This was a complete reinterpretation of the Jewish hope for an anointed king descended from David. Perhaps before Yeshua's death, his disciples had already acclaimed him as Messiah, but they became convinced of this from experiences that proved to them he was again alive. Thus the RESURRECTION is the second major theme. The Messiah now came to mean, not a conquering, successful king (Messiah ben David; the long-awaited for Messiah that would reverse the fortunes of Israel, once again making them the "head" and not the "tail"), but a crucified Lord (Messiah ben Joseph-a Suffering Servant) whose unique relationship to God could be suggested only partially by the titles applied to him.

Now I say now bears explaining. There is a big difference between the Jewish followers and Gentile followers of Jesus; a very big difference between the Jerusalem church and the churches of Paul, the gospel of James, Peter, and John and the gospel of Paul. Over time with the emerging Gentile Pauline churches we see a complete change in "religious beliefs" as compared with the most intimate Jewish followers of Jesus. Again we must go to the texts for our differences; there is a major difference between what the Jewish Masoretic texts teach concerning "the" Messiah and what the Greek texts teach concerning "the" Messiah.

Understand that following the destruction of the Temple and the scattering of the Jews that over the next 4-5 centuries the Jewish church would be persecuted out of existence. We are left with a Gentile Church of ever gaining strength; especially when "Christianity" became the religion of the state of Rome. Therefore, the non-Jewish "believers," and I say "believers" very loosely, in explaining and defending their faith, these Gentile disciples of Jesus found passages in the Greek Translation of the Old Testament that they believed were prophecies of his birth, death, resurrection, and nature (for example, Psalm 110:1, Isaiah 53; Daniel 7:13-14). As I have tried to show most of these are pure fabrications from the purposeful misquotations of the Jewish Bible which occurred long before the birth of Jesus. These were never prophecies about Jesus but re-modifications of the texts by the Essenes where they changed the concepts of the human Jewish Messiah more in the fashion of their cosmic sun-g-dman redeemer which comes straight out of astral, solar, sun-worship. These same non-Jewish and Gentile believers also preserved Yeshua's sayings and the stories of his life, which they interpreted in light of their faith.

Jesus had proclaimed the gospel ("good news") of the coming reign, or kingdom, of God and carried on a ministry of teaching, forgiveness, and healing. Although much of his teaching agreed with that of other Jews, his more radical and prophetic sayings made enemies. The high priest (Sadducee) and his associates feared Jesus (Pharisee) as a threat to the established order, and the Roman governor Pontius Pilate was persuaded to have Jesus crucified.

Other new experiences of ecstasy and prophecy were interpreted as gifts of the Holy Spirit when many of them were little more than emotionalism because the Holy Spirit will not "anoint" lies and error or contraction of the true Jewish Scriptures. Indeed, most books of the New Testament ponder the relation of the old and the new. Christians, and Jesus himself, believed in the same God as other Jews and recognized the authority of the Old Testament. Yet Jesus, as his accounts in the New Testament show, had supposedly made radical statements that undermined the separateness of Judaism and led logically to the admission of Gentiles into the community. Thus, there emerged a Church embracing Jews and non-Jews that was interpreted as based on a **RENEWED COVENANT** inaugurated by Jesus. Paul, the greatest apostle of the Gentile mission, defended his policies by teaching that the basis for acceptance by God is faith in Jesus Christ; yet Paul, who did not wish to break with the Jewish identity and community would end up doing the very same thing in his creation of a new religion build around "his gospel" and "his unique" understanding of Jesus which Israel and Judaism could not accept.

The New Testament contains a strong apocalyptic element owing to the Essene influence, whom upon study, can be shown to be the "first Christians" as set off from the Ebionites who were the first true followers of Yeshua. Yeshua's parables and sayings regarding the coming reign of God are enigmatic, and it is not certain that he expected the early end of the world; but many original Christians believed they were living in the last age. Nevertheless, much of the moral teaching of the New Testament is aimed at everyday life in this world, and Christian behavior is a constant theme. But understand that the audience to whom these New Testament writings were directed were heathen and were in desperate need of morality and ethics. The New Testament reflects other concerns of community life, including public worship and church organization, but equal emphasis is placed on individual prayer and communion with God.

THE CANON:

The process by which the canon of the New Testament was formed began in the 2d century, probably with a collection of ten letters of Paul. Toward the end of that century, Irenaeus argued for the unique authority of the portion of the Canon called the Gospels (NOTICE THE FIRST CALL (by Gentiles) TO RECOGNIZE THE INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITING CAME IN THE LATE SECOND CENTURY)!

Acceptance of the other books came gradually and Gentile church councils after Gentile church councils debated the issues endlessly. The church in Egypt used more than the present 27 books, and the Syriac-speaking churches fewer. The question of an official canon became urgent during the 4th century. It was mainly through the influence of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, and because Jerome included the 27 books in his Latin version of the Bible called the Vulgate, that the present canon came to be accepted.

Answer for yourself: Why did it take almost 400 years for the New Testament writings to be deemed "Scripture"?

Answer for yourself: Why didn't the Apostolic church under James decide that Paul's writings were to be Scripture, let alone the writing of men like Jude, Peter, and Titus?

Answer for yourself: Why didn't Paul (Acts 28) reason with the Jews in Rome from his own personal scriptures (Galatians, Romans, I Corinthians, etc.) instead of resorting to the Law and Prophets as recorded for us? The answer is obvious, Paul did not consider his writings on par, either authoritatively or having the same level of inspiration as those of the Old Testament, or else he would have used them.

Paul did not ever consider his writings to have replaced the Bible Jesus used as seen from the example at the end of his life when he was teaching other Gentiles and Jews in Rome concerning Yeshua it is recorded for us that he did not choose "his own writings" but rather chose to teach from the Law and the Prophets for Paul knew something that the Gentile Christian Church has never learned or forgotten.....nothing will ever replace or take the authority of the Jewish Scriptures. Let us look as this example and learn from it.

Acts 28:23 And when they had appointed him a day, there came many to him into his lodging; to whom he (Paul) expounded and testified the kingdom of God, persuading them concerning Jesus, both out of the law of Moses, and out of the prophets, from morning till evening. (KJV)

DIVISIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT:

The New Testament consists of FOUR GOSPELS,, the ACTS OF THE APOSTLES, and collections of EPISTLES.

The Gospels. Originally gospel meant "good news" (Greek evangelion). The term was later applied to books embodying this message. These are not biographies but proclamations of the good news in story form. Although all dates for New Testament books are debated, prevailing opinion dates MARK AD 68-72, LUKE and MATTHEW c.85, and JOHN 95-100. The first three, called synoptic because they can be compared side by side, have a complicated literary relationship with each other. Probably Matthew and Luke used Mark and a lost document called Q (German Quelle, "source"), consisting mainly of Yeshua's sayings. The parables--short illustrative stories told by Yeshua, usually reflecting daily life--are prominent in the synoptics. The Gospel of John differs from the others in structure and reflects the theological development of the first century, but it contains traditions independent of the synoptics.

The Acts. The Acts of the Apostles was evidently written by Luke as a sequel to his Gospel. It recounts the traditions of the earliest churches in Palestine and gives the details of Paul's missionary journeys as he continues to take and teach the religion of Yeshua to Gentiles throughout the world. Sadly, the unlearned often come to see that Paul was to start a new religion for the Gentile, but upon Hebrew and Greek studies, you will that nothing was further from the truth. Paul continued to take the Festivals, Holy Days, and Sabbaths of Yahweh to the Gentiles in his message of the Gospel.

The Epistles. Two kinds of Epistles are attributed to St. Paul in the New Testament. Nine of them (ten, if EPHESIANS is included) are letters addressed by Paul to specific churches (not for general circulation or correction) and deal mainly with problems of faith, morals, and community life in specific congregations. These letters disclose Paul's interpretation of Pharisaical Judaism as he draws from it the practical expressions of belief and conduct for Gentiles who are turn to faith in Yeshua and his God. Today we look backward and call his preaching a form of "Christianity," but in reality, his teachings embraced little of what we practice today as we have fallen from the mark in obedience when compared with the standard. NOTICE ALSO, ALMOST ALL OF PAUL'S LETTERS ARE INTENDED FOR CORRECTION AND REBUKE OF GENTILES, ALWAYS CALLING FOR THEIR REPENTANCE, EITHER IN THOUGHT, BELIEF, OR ACTION. Paul's preaching was to lead the heathen to the God of Israel, to the faith of Israel, and to the religion of Israel and not a new religion but yet that is what had been done after Paul.

The remainder are not actual letters; rather they are writings in letter form, intended for the whole church or large parts of it. Thus, the pastoral Epistles--1 and 2 TIMOTHY and TITUS--written in Paul's name, contain directions for church leaders and warn against errors in doctrine and behavior. HEBREWS is a carefully constructed sermon by an unknown author and interprets Christ as high priest and urges fidelity in time of persecution.

The general, or catholic, Epistles are so called because they are directed to the church as a whole. The Epistle of JAMES emphasizes the importance of good deeds against an empty type of belief that involves no right action. The first Epistle of PETER proclaims joy in the face of persecution and is addressed particularly to congregations with newly baptized members. The Epistles of JOHN resemble the fourth Gospel. St. John teaches the intimate relationship between love of the brotherhood and the true doctrine about Christ; he also attacks division within the church.

Revelation. The Book of Revelation was written to encourage Messianic Believers (called the "Way," "Nasoreans," or "Nazarenes" in the first century and not "Christians," for only the adversaries of this movement called the Messianic Believers "Christians" (a term of contempt) at this time). It would be these believers who would be persecuted under Domitian (AD 81-96), and let me remind you, this was to happen in their day and time, NOT IN OURS! Others, especially today with the advent of Dispensationalism, feel that it portrays the future through many symbols, and the prophet expects God's judgment on the Roman Empire, a 1,000-year reign of Christ, and a new heaven and a new Earth. I do not wish to get into this at this time in this letter, however, if you study you will find that the word "thousand" in Revelation 20 (thousand years) is PLURAL...meaning "thousands of years." This is another example of poor translation.

Answer for yourself: Now knowing this, what does that do to DISPENSATIONAL THEOLOGY and their endless parade of last-days charts and anti-Christ teachings?

DIFFERENT VERSIONS OF THE BIBLE:

Several Aramaic targums (free translations or paraphrases) of the Old Testament exist; some of them may be older than the Christian Era. The Greek Septuagint, whose canon was not strictly defined, was gradually produced during the last three centuries BC. An Old Latin version of both Testaments was revised by Jerome, producing the Vulgate. Ancient versions exist in Syriac, Coptic, Armenian, and other languages.

During the Middle Ages, parts of the Bible were put into Anglo-Saxon and Middle English. The first English versions of the entire Bible were made (1380-93) by John WYCLIFFE and his associates who used the Latin text. The REFORMATION gave further impulse to translations into modern languages, notably that of Martin LUTHER in German and William TYNDALE in English. Among later versions are the following: Miles COVERDALE's Bible (1535), Matthew's Bible (1537), the Great Bible (1539), Geneva Bible (1560), Rheims-Douai Bible (1582, 1609), King James, or Authorized, Version (1611), English Revised Version (1881-85), American Standard Version (1946-57), New English Bible (1961-70), Jerusalem Bible (1966), New American Bible (1970), Today's English Version (1966-76), and the Revised Standard Version (1946-1971).

more to follow



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #7

THE FIRST NEW TESTAMENT:

The key players in the history of the Bible haven't necessarily been popular--or orthodox.

MARCION-A BRIEF SKETCH: (c.85-c.160)

The reason Christians have 27 books in their New Testament, some scholars say, is partly because early church leaders didn't like the 12 that Marcion had compiled. They didn't care much for Marcion, either. Let us look at historical references that remain for us today.

Famous bishop Polycarp (John the Apostle's student) called Marcion "the firstborn of Satan" because of his rejection of the Old Testament as the Bible given to mankind by God and for trying to replace the Hebrew Old Testament by canonizing his own revelation and calling it a "New Testament." Justin Martyr said this wealthy shipbuilder "taught men to deny that God is the maker of all things." Tertullian said he was "more savage than the beasts of that barbarous region" where he grew up, in what is now northern Turkey. The lowest blow, which many scholars discount, came from Hippolytus when he said Marcion was excommunicated by his father for seducing a virgin. Then again, the sect Marcion later established would baptize only believers who vowed to remain celibate.

Now pay close attention. Marcion insisted on this because he said there were two Gods: the harsh, Creator God of the Old Testament and the loving God revealed through Yeshua. Did you notice the dualism? We have again encountered the Persian concept of cosmic dualism...good God versus Bad God. This perversion exists to day in the prolific errors perpetrated in Charismatic churches concerning the spiritual warfare message (see my paper on Angels and their role in spiritual warfare). Procreation, Marcion explained, was the idea of the Creator God, and Marcion wanted nothing to do with him. We see in this the total repudiation of the first positive commandment of the Torah (be fruitful and multiply). Again, his anti-Judaism and anti-Semitism is showing.

To further distance themselves from this God, Marcionites fasted and shunned worldly goods. A fifth-century writer told of meeting a 90-year-old Marcionite who washed every morning in his own spit so he could avoid using the water provided by the Creator.

Some scholars estimate that by the time Marcion died, when his church was at its peak of popularity, more than half of Christianity was under the sway of Marcionite teaching. That means over half of Christianity is anti-Semitic, anti-Judaic, and practicing a perversion of spiritual warfare! Look at Christianity today, and see for yourself the fruit of this sinister man and his teachings. We have a faith that denies the faith of its founder and has spent almost 1700 years trying to wipe out every Jew from the face of the plant; if not in programs, crusades, and gas ovens, even more devilish, by conversion to Paganized Christianity where a Jew would be forced to deny Moses, Israel, the real Yeshua, the Law, Sinai, and adopt a paganized Messiah! Thank

God no more has converted to this deception than history records.

The first "New Testament" was the one Marcion compiled after he was excommunicated by his own father in 144 A.D., at the age of about 60. Marcion's Bible rejected the entire Old Testament (THIS WAS JESUS' BIBLE) along with its heroes and prophets. Marcion believed that everyone in the Old Testament had been deceived by the Creator Himself. He also rejected all New Testament references that suggested the Creator and the loving God were the same. In the end, his Bible included only the Gospel of Luke and some letters of Paul. Two hundred years later, the sect was nearly extinct. But it had prodded the church to begin defining what Christians should believe and what books should be called the Word of God, since the Old Testament had to be rejected!

Having given a overview, now I will give you an in depth analysis of the tragedy of the FIRST NEW TESTAMENT from Marcion.

MARCION AND HIS BIBLE: THE FIRST BIBLE-FAR FROM INSPIRED AND INERRANT:

Marcion is the first person known to us who published a fixed collection of what we would call New Testament books. Others may have done so before him; if so, we have no knowledge of them. He rejected the Old Testament totally, as having no relevance or authority for Christians; his collection was therefore designed to be the first Bible. I wonder what Yeshua thought of his endeavors since Marcion threw out the Bible Yeshua (Yeshua) used. It is amazing that before Marcion (over 140 years) we find no evidence of the "church" using or even having a need for any writings other than the Jewish Bible of Yeshua. Just consider this one fact for a minute. What implications does this have for you as a believer who attends contemporary churches where the Old Testament is rarely used?

Marcion was born about 100 C.E. at Sinope, a seaport on the Black Sea coast of Asia Minor. His father was a leader in the synagogue of that city, and Marcion was brought up in the Apostolic Faith. Of all the apostles, the one who appealed to him most strongly was Paul, to whom he became passionately devoted, ultimately concluding that he was the ONLY apostle who preserved the teaching of Yeshua in its purity. This strikes me as almost unbelievable. Paul never met Yeshua or heard him preach or teach one lesson. Paul's only encounter with Yeshua was a vision; it is for that reason I find it hard to imagine that Marcion would discount the lives and testimonies of those who not only knew Yeshua personally, but lived and ministered along his side for three and one-half years. It is hard for any unbiased person to believe that Paul's understanding was greater than James for example; after all James was Yeshua's brother who lived with him over thirty years and was Yeshua's choice to lead the Messianic Congregation after his ascension (and not Paul).

Marcion embraced with great zeal the teachings of Paul, especially his gospel of justification by divine grace, apart from legal works. This view is an incorrect assessment as I have shown in previous newsletters regarding the role of the Law with grace. Marcion has been called "the only man in the early church who understood Paul," however it would be later said of him also that "even in his understanding he misunderstood him." Marcion's refusal to allow any element of law-keeping (obedience) be connected to Paul's understanding of the message of salvation (which is connected with faith) **led Marcion to the tragic and incorrect conclusion that the Old Testament, its laws and statutes had been superseded by the gospel.** There is only one problem: the Bible in the New Testament never says that (often you have to consult the original languages to see the hidden truths and more correct understandings concerning this issue). **Due to inadequate renderings in the English we often arrive at conclusions which were never intended by the original writers.** The gospel, Marcion believed, was an "entirely new teaching brought to earth by Messiah". Marcion believed that the law and the prophets made no sort of preparation for the Gospel, and if some passages in Paul's correspondence suggested that they did, then those passages were reasoned by Marcion to be a kind of "judaizing" (reverting back to Hebraic customs and understandings) against whom Marcion believed Paul to have preached against in Galatians and other letters. **Marcion made one tragic mistake, he read the New Testament in Greek without reverting back to the Hebrew for comparisons in doctrines and**

teachings. Such a grave mistake is responsible today for over 1500 denominations that make a laughing stock of Eph 4:5 which holds up "one faith" as the ideal. That one faith once delivered to the saints was and still is Messianic Judaism with Yeshua as its Messiah.

Sources teach us that Marcion appears to have remained in communion with the "proto-Catholic Church" of his day so long as he lived in Asia Minor. There is some reasons to think that he shared his radical thoughts with leading churchmen of the region, such as Polycarp of Smyrna (disciple of the Apostle John) and Papias of Hierapolis, but found them unresponsive.

Desiring a more positive response for his radical teachings, he ventured to talk with the churchman of Rome where he made a handsome donation of money to the church (he was a ship owner and was quite well off). His understanding of the gospel and its implications was so self-evidently right to his own way of thinking that he could not believe that it would fail to be equally self-evident to any other unprejudiced mind. But the Roman churchmen were disturbed by his doctrine that they not only rejected it but even returned the money he had presented to the church! That would be a miracle if done in today's churches!

Not only did Marcion regard Paul as the only faithful apostle of Christ (Messiah); he maintained that the original apostles had corrupted their Master's teaching with an admixture of legalism. **Not only did he reject the Old Testament (the Jewish Bible Yeshua used); he distinguished the God of the Old Testament from the God of the New Testament. Now we have two Gods.** This distinction of two deities, each with his independent existence speaks of the Gnostic influence on Marcion's thought. The God who created the material universe, the God of Israel, was (as Marcion held) different from the Father of whom Yeshua (Yeshua) spoke. The Father of Yeshua was the good and merciful God of whom none had ever heard of before until Yeshua came to reveal him. Along the lines of Gnostic teachings, the God who made the material world was an inferior deity (inferior in status and morality) to the supreme God who was pure spirit. **Now we have a "good God" and an "evil God".** The Gnostic depreciation of the material order finds an echo in Marcion's refusal to believe that Yeshua entered human life by being "born of a woman" (Ga. 4:4). The result of such teaching is that one will look forward to the day that he can escape from the evil body and become pure spirit. Does this sound familiar (Rom. 8:24). **Paul bought into this dualism in a big way.**

We are fortunate that at this time the church of Rome was yet enlightened and unprejudiced, but that would change later. Still the church of Rome found Marcion's teachings unacceptable. So Marcion, despairing of being able to convince the catholic church anywhere of the truth of his message, withdrew from the catholic fellowship and established a church of his own. The church survived for several generations which is surprising since its membership was maintained solely through conversion. It could not keep its membership up by incorporating the children of existing members, for celibacy was obligatory on all its membership. At the same time, Marcion was a faithful enough Paulinist to allow no discrimination against female members of his church in matters of privilege or function because he agreed with Paul that there was "neither male nor female" (Gal. 3:28).

Marcion provided his followers with an edition of the holy Scriptures. Marcion's new scriptures included no part of the Old Testament (Jewish Bible) and were written in Greek. Please keep in mind that he did not call his collection "The New Testament". It would be another 100 years or so before anyone would come up with that idea. Yeshua had been gone over 110 years before Marcion decided to create his new scriptures. Just think about it! Christianity did not have a need for a "New Testament". **From what did the church teach during that 110 years since they did not have a New Testament? They used the same Bible that Yeshua used; the Jewish Bible (Old Testament).**

A NUMBER OF QUESTIONS SHOULD COME TO YOU MIND AT THIS TIME

- **Why didn't the "church" see a need for a New Testament?**
- **Why didn't Yeshua tell his disciples to copy his words & produce a replacement Bible?**

- Why didn't Yeshua apostles record Yeshua's words or their own?
- Why were the writings of the Jewish Bible used as the only Scripture?
- Why was Marcion so anti-Semitic?

Marcion created "new scriptures" for his followers. He referred to them by the titles he gave to the two component parts: The Gospel and The Apostle. To his own Bible he would later add a series of "Antitheses," which set out the incompatibility of law and gospel, of the Creator-Judge of the Old Testament and the merciful Father of the New Testament (who had nothing to do with either creation or judgment).

Answer for yourself: Do you not find it startling that the teaching that the Old Testament was replaced by a New Testament began with a man who also saw two Gods?

Stop and consider what I just said for a minute (Selah). Because Marcion saw "two Gods" he had need for only the revelation of the "good God" or the New Testament which served as a "replacement testament" to replace the Old Testament of the "Creator-Judge" God of the Old Testament.

Answer for yourself: Now, let me ask you do you believe in two Gods? How about three? Get the point. **The first idea of replacing "law" with "grace" came from one who denied the cardinal teaching of the Bible: "Hear O Israel, the Lord is God, the Lord is ONE!"** So when people tell you that they are "not under the Law" I wonder if they do not believe in Jehovah, the God of the Old Testament, who gave the Law in the first place, let alone who would later send His Messiah in the New Testament.

The holy Scriptures to which the "Antitheses" served as an introduction inevitably included no part of the Old Testament; they consisted only of an edition of the Greek New Testament. Marcion did not call it a "New Testament", so far as we know, he may not have given any one title to the edition as a whole. He referred to it, as stated above, by the titles which he gave to its two component parts: Gospel and Apostle. Our main source for information about Marcion's Bible is Tertullian's treatise Against Marcion, written over a half century later (190 A.D.), when Marcion had been dead for some decades. Tertullian's response to Marcion is often hostile yet his factual data appears to be reliable.

Marcion's Gospel was an edition of the Gospel of Luke. The selection of Luke is in speculation even today, but more than likely owing to his affinity to Paul, he choose the Gospel of Luke because he was associated with Paul. Marcion nowhere mentioned Luke's name in connection with it; it was presented simply as the gospel of Christ. Its text was purged of those elements which were inconsistent with Marcion's understanding of the truth and which therefore, on his principles, must have been "added" by judaizing scribes. **For example the birth of John the Baptist was omitted because it implied a connection between Yeshua and something that went before Him (remember to create a new religion one must have Yeshua not rely on anything in the past, but rather teach everything as if it were new and different). Yeshua brought nothing new with his ministry. He did not create a new religion. He did not do away with Judaism and give Christianity as its replacement.** Marcion, as well as numerous others, tried valiantly to cover over the fact that Yeshua brought us nothing new, only fulfilled what was necessary. If we are forced to see Yeshua quoting other teachers that were his forefathers then it is easy to see that he did not come to bring a new religion as we have incorrectly supposed.

In Marcion's gospel we find no reference the birth of Yeshua whom many feel was written later and added subsequent to original New Testament of Marcion. According to Marcion, Yeshua entered the world not by virgin birth but by a descent as supernatural as was his later ascension. **Now pay attention. The material and doctrines that will be very important to the Roman Catholic Church as they will create a new religion later are not to be found among Marcion's Bible or his Gospel of Christ. This means that either the Roman Catholic Church added the accounts or Marcion deleted them from previously existing writings. The problem with the "deletions" is that many of them would have benefited Marcion and his theological positions and that being so it is very hard to understand why Marcion would omit such passages...such as Rom. 9:10-11.....these are "key" passages that Marcion would**

have used in his debate with the Jews if such passages would have existed. Not only "passages" were omitted but whole chapters like Gal. 3 were not present in 150 with Marcion's first New Testament and the collection of Paul's writings.

Answer for yourself: What were some of the passages not found in Marcion's Gospel which would later show up in the Roman Catholic version?

- The birth of John the Baptist
- The birth of Yeshua
- The immersion of Yeshua
- Yeshua's genealogy of Luke 3:23-38
- The temptation narrative of Luke 4:1-13
- Yeshua preaching at Nazareth in Luke 4:16-30

Answer for yourself: It is possible that the text of Luke which Marcion used as the basis for his Gospel was not identical with the text that has come down to us? More than likely "yes". It may have been an earlier edition, lacking the first two chapters. Some consider it a "Proto-Luke". But even if the text which lay before Marcion did lack the first two chapters, it began at the latest with Luke 3:1, "In the fifteenth year of Tiberius Caesar," and those are the words with which Marcion's Gospel began. But the material which follows immediately was unacceptable to him. The account of John the Baptist's ministry and his baptism of Yeshua implies some continuity between Yeshua and the old order. So does the genealogy of Luke 3:23-38, tracing Yeshua's ancestry back to Adam through David & Abraham. Thus it must be excluded! The temptation narrative (Luke 4:1-13) represents Yeshua quoting from Deuteronomy three times, as though it had authority in his eyes. This, for Marcion, was impossible. Surely Yeshua came to begin a new thing; a new Religion! Surely, as Marcion would have us believe, Yeshua did no longer consider Deuteronomy as a necessary Scripture. Marcion was wrong! Equally impossible for Marcion, was the idea that Yeshua, preaching in the synagogue at Nazareth (Luke 4:16-30), should have claimed that his ministry was the fulfillment of Old Testament prophecy. So, having begun his edition of the Gospel with Luke 3:1, Marcion went straight on to Luke 4:31 and continued: "Yeshua came down to Capernaum" as though he came down there and then from heaven, fully grown.

In place of "Thy Kingdom come" in his version of the Lord's Prayer (Luke 11:2), Marcion's Gospel had the interesting variation: "Let thy Holy Spirit come on us and cleanse us." He may have found this in the copy of Luke which served as the basis for his edition, or it may have been his own addition. If he added it himself, it is interesting that it would have found its way into the textual tradition of "orthodox" Christians for it is cited by the church father Gregory of Nyssa and Maqsimus of Turin, and is the reading on one or two Greek manuscripts of the gospels.

The "old is good" (Luke 5:39) is omitted because it might be taken to imply approval of the Old Testament order and the religion of Yeshua. Possibly Yeshua did not come to replace Judaism with Christianity! Marcion could not entertain such an idea. The reference to Yeshua's mother and brothers could not be retained in Luke 8:19 (For Marcion Yeshua could not belong to any human family). It had to go. There are other peculiarities of Marcion's Gospel which can be explained with equal ease. It is simple; Marcion believed Yeshua was come to bring a replacement faith to Israel and anything that would show otherwise must be stricken from the record! Most Protestant and Catholic churches of today have been so influenced by Marcion that they ascribe to his basic premises! Such a shame.

Marcion's "The Apostle" was an edition of ten letters of Paul. The three Pastoral Epistles (1 & 2 Timothy, Titus) were not included because he used his own Gospel for the basis of this "edition" and it did not contain them. The Chester Beatty codex (P46) of Paul's letters also does not include the same books. Also in Marcion "Apostle" the two letters to the Corinthians are combined as well as the letters to Thessalonica.

MARCION HAD A PARTICULAR ORDER FOR THE ARRANGEMENT OF THE BOOKS IN HIS FIRST NEW TESTAMENT

Now pay attention. The Marcionite order of Paul's letters is given below:

1. **Galatians**
2. **Corinthians**
3. **Romans**
4. **Thessalonians**
5. **Laodiceans (Ephesians)**
6. **Colossians**
7. **Philippians**
8. **Philemon**

Notice the order of these letters in the Roman Catholic Church's Bible:

1. **Romans**
2. **Corinthians**
3. **Galatians**
4. **Ephesians**
5. **Philippians**
6. **Colossians**
7. **Thessalonians**
8. **1 & 2 Timothy (not in Marcion's Bible)**
9. **Titus (not in Marcion's Bible)**
10. **Philemon.**

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that the book of Romans was placed first in the canon of the Roman Catholic Church? I wonder why? The Roman Church had to justify the shift in authority from Jerusalem to Rome and what better way to show it than let the book of Romans appear "first" as the first and trend-setting epistle in the New Testament. Also they added books. Again, I wonder why? Or, did Marcion omit these books? Who would benefit the most?

At the beginning of his Apostle Marcion placed the letter to the Galatians in first position. This was to dramatize the differences & opposites between Paul and the Jerusalem apostles. To Marcion the letter (Galatians) mounted a direct attack on the Jerusalem apostles, for it was at their instance (and rightly so), or at least by their agents, that attempts were being made to win Paul's Gentile converts in Galatia over to a judaistic form of Christianity. Marcion considered this heresy. God did not! The remaining letters of Marcion's canon were arranged in descending order of length, the two letters of Corinthians being reckoned together as one composite letter and the two letter to the Thessalonians being treated in the same way.

Anything that appeared inconsistent with what he believed to be authentic Pauline teaching was regarded as corruption from an alien hand and was removed. The mention of Abraham as the prototype of all who are justified by faith (Gal. 3:6-9) could not be allowed to remain in his Canon because he could not all to exist any connection between law and the gospel as in Gal. 3:15-25. Thus it most likely was removed from Romans chapter 4.

Now for the most startling information concerning Marcion. His edition of Romans lacked Romans 1:19-2:1; 3:21-4:25; and all of Romans 9-11 except Romans 10:1-4 and 11:33-36, not counting everything after Romans 14:23. The idea of establishing the law through faith (Rom. 3:31), the application of the story of Abraham in chapter 4, the grappling with the mystery of Israel's unbelief in chapters 9-11 (with their concentration of proof-texts from the Old Testament), were all incompatible with Paul's gospel as Marcion

understood it. As for chapter 15, its opening section includes a general endorsement of the **Christian value of the Old Testament scriptures (vv4)** and a string of quotations designed to show that the Gentile mission was foreseen and validated by Old Testament writers (vv 8-12), while its closing paragraph (vv 25-33) bears witness to a concern on Paul's part for the church of Jerusalem which Marcion must find incredible, given his understanding of the relation between Paul and that church.

I find it utterly amazing when I stop to realize that infamous passages concerning the Jews being "blinded" theologically was not written and added to the New Testament until after 150 A.D. and even then it was written by Gentiles no less:

Rom 11:7 7 What then? Israel hath not obtained that which he seeketh for; but the election hath obtained it, and the rest were blinded (KJV)

Rom 11:25 25 For I would not, brethren, that ye should be ignorant of this mystery, lest ye should be wise in your own conceits; that blindness in part is happened to Israel, until the fullness of the Gentiles be come in. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: What other "key" passage that is the foundation for Gentile Christianity was not in the New Testament until after 150 A.D. and which can be shown to have been written by non-Jews and ascribed to Pauline authorship?

You better sit down for this for it is a land mine!

Rom 10:9-10 9 That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. 10 For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. (KJV)

Notice conspicuously absent is Rom. 10:9-10 which states that "if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Yeshua, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness: and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation".

Answer for yourself: Why would not Marcion have included such a "Pauline Dogma" since he was pro-Pauline himself? The answer is simple. **The text in question was not given as inspired by the Holy Spirit to the Apostles and is not part of the original Gospel of Yeshua. It was written and added after Marcion and was not part of the Gospel or included in any Gospel writing as late as 140 years after Yeshua.**

Answer for yourself: Did you hear what I said?

Answer for yourself: Don't you think it is about time you began to study to see what kind of religion you practice; the religion according to the teachings of Yeshua or according to the teachings of men? **Salvation consists of both obedience to law (commandments) and grace; not just grace alone.**

TWO DIFFERENT MESSAGES AND TWO DIFFERENT "GOSPELS" IN THE NEW TESTAMENT TODAY

Because of Marcion and men like him we have two competing Gospels today. To Marcion the "God who created all things" had nothing to do with the gospel; he was a different being from the God and Father of our Lord Yeshua Christ. In this we see Marcion's rejection of all the Old Testament (the Bible Yeshua used). To what extent Marcion's text differed from the one he had inherited and used for the basis of his gospel is not easily discerned. It would appear to have been copied substantially as before containing deletions of Jewish

influence and authority, with very little actual additions by Marcion himself. Suffice to say he "dejudiazed" the Scriptures and destroyed the Hebrew roots of the early faith. What is problematic, as said before, is the absence in Marcion's Canon of many texts recognized as "Pauline" by toady's scholars, but which would most assuredly would have been included by Marcion if they had existed in his day (Rom. 10: 9-10). What does that say for our "quick altar prayers" by which we give false security to repentant sinners who "repeat after me" and who we never see again! The failure to include many passages we accept today as "Bible" by our churches can only mean one thing: they did not exist 140 years after Yeshua! Thus, many additions to the "inspired and infallible" Word of God would be done by Catholics who followed. Thus, they would counter Marcion with their "own Bible" to counteract his Bible. They would write their own authority (Catholic) into the Bible (rework Marcion's Bible) to replace the authority of Jerusalem with the authority of Rome. The authority of Jerusalem was written out of the New Testament and replaced with the authority of Rome. The Catholic Church replaced the Jewish Synagogue. The Pagan Holidays replaced the Lord's Holy Days. Sunday replaced the Sabbath. Tithing to an "organization" or a "building" replaced "righteous giving to the needy." The Temple tax to support the "organization" (Temple) was replaced by robbing the saints of God's provision to them as distributed in the "poor tithe". The Noachide Laws for Gentile acceptance into Israel was replaced with Church Dogma of Augustine and Constantine. Martin Luther would shortly follow. The Lord's Supper was replaced with "Sunday cups and crackers". The Passover was replaced with Easter (fornication festival). Need I go on, because it does not stop here!

In Summary:

- **Luke 1:1-2:52 Does not contain the introduction or the story of Yeshua's birth.**
- **Luke 5:39 Does not contain the phrase "The old is better".**
- **Luke 8:19 Makes no reference to Yeshua's mother and brothers.**
- **Luke 11:2 Adds "Let thy Holy Spirit come on us & cleans us".**
- **Luke 19:9 Does not contain the phrase "because he is the son of Abraham.**
- **Rom. 1:19-2:1 Does not contain the reasons for and the results of Gentile guilt and sin.**
- **Rom. 3:21-4:25 Does not contain section on righteousness and acceptance by God of both Jew and Gentile based on faith and obedience.**
- **Rom. 9-11 All omitted except for 10:1-4 where we see an unbalanced picture of Christ ending all law and 11:33-36. We have a distorted view of Jew & Gentile in God's purpose.**
- **Everything after Rom. 14:23 is omitted.**
- **Omission of foundational faith text of Rom. 10:9-10.**

Marcion's Bible is of great significance to every modern Christian, because the power and authority of the many different Christian religions have been created from the words of the New Testament and not from the Old Testament, which was the authority for the followers of Christ for over 200 years.

More to follow



HOW WELL DO YOU UNDERSTAND THE BIBLE THAT YOU USE FOR FAITH AND PRACTICE? #8

EARLY VERSIONS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT: WHAT WRITING WERE GIVEN BY G-D...AND WHICH ARE WE TO TRUST?

MARCION (c. 140)

- Luke
- Romans
- 1 Corinthians
- 2 Corinthians
- Galatians
- Ephesians
- Philippians
- Colossians
- 1 Thessalonians
- 2 Thessalonians
- Philemon

MURATORIAN CANON (c.200)

- (Matthew)
- (Mark)
- Luke
- John
- Acts
- Romans
- 1 Corinthians
- 2 Corinthians
- Galatians
- Ephesians
- Philippians
- Colossians
- 1 Thessalonians
- 2 Thessalonians
- 1 Timothy
- 2 Timothy
- Titus
- 1 John
- 2 John

- **Jude**
- **Revelation of John**
- **Wisdom of Solomon**
- **Revelation of Peter**

EUSEBIUS (c. 325)

- **Matthew**
- **Mark**
- **Luke**
- **John**
- **Acts**
- **Romans**
- **1 Corinthians**
- **2 Corinthians**
- **Galatians**
- **Ephesians**
- **Philippians**
- **Colossians**
- **1 Thessalonians**
- **2 Thessalonians**
- **1 Timothy**
- **2 Timothy**
- **Titus**
- **1 Peter**
- **1 John**
- **Revelation of John**

ATHANASIUS (367)

- **Matthew**
- **Mark**
- **Luke**
- **John**
- **Acts**
- **Romans**
- **1 Corinthians**
- **2 Corinthians**
- **Galatians**
- **Ephesians**
- **Philippians**
- **Colossians**
- **1 Thessalonians**
- **2 Thessalonians**
- **1 Timothy**
- **2 Timothy**
- **Titus**
- **Philemon**
- **Hebrews**
- **James**
- **1 Peter**
- **2 Peter**
- **1 John**
- **2 John**

- **3 John**
- **Jude**
- **Revelation of John**



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



A BRIEF HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT - WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TOLD BY YOUR PASTOR

In the two thousand years since the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, the world of Christendom has seen incredible changes, including a split with the Eastern Orthodox Church and a Protestant Reformation, accompanied by a rejection of much core ideology. Yet throughout it all, the collection of scripture called the New Testament has remained unchanged and largely unquestioned, even though it was assembled by the same church leaders whose beliefs many now refute. It has always amazed me that as a former Protestant I always accepted the "Catholic's Bible".

Answer for yourself: Do you not see the folly of the collection of these documents by those who are understood by most today to have been blatant idolaters?

To challenge the veracity of the canonical New Testament is, at best, an uncomfortable position; such questions strike at the very heart of most Christians' faith. Nevertheless, we at Bet Emet understand that these sacred writings have come to us only after decades of oral traditions and centuries of scribal rewrites, additions, deletions, and fictional creationism much according to the beliefs of select denominations in the early days of Christianity.

It is only by attempting to study the origins and evolution of the New Testament scriptures that one can hope to discover the true historical Jesus—a worthy goal of any Christian believer.

When reading the New Testament, one is poignantly reminded of how translation, particularly of archaic language, is subject to personal interpretation. It is therefore vitally important that we get as close to the original source as possible. It is therefore vitally important that we get as close to the original source as possible. The oldest surviving complete text of the New Testament is the Codex Sinaiticus, dating back to the middle of the fourth century. The oldest fragments, the Bodmer and Beatty Papyri and Papyrus 52, date back to the second century but only contain bits of the Gospel of John. All of these texts are Greek. This presents a few disturbing problems. If one wants to uncover the truth about a Jewish Rabbi named "Yeshua" he has to look at Jewish sources and not foreign Greek ones.

First, Jesus's native tongue was Aramaic, and even if he knew Greek, he certainly did not speak it to his apostles, many of whom were uneducated fishermen. Without any surviving Aramaic texts, the actual words of Christ are lost forever, mired in a sea of subjective translation by ancient scribes.

Second, we are faced with a gap of as much as three hundred years between the composition of a text and our surviving copies. In a world without a printing press, texts would often undergo drastic evolution through centuries of handwritten duplication. The sooner you face this reality and deal with it by

adjusting your religious beliefs to accept only what the Jewish Scriptures had said the sooner you will be able to cast out the leaven of today's pharisees.

ORIGINS OF THE CANON...AND WE CALL THIS "INSPIRED"?

Our four canonical gospels did not begin their lives as the gospels of "Matthew," "Mark," "Luke" and "John." Different groups of early Christians maintained their own oral traditions of Yeshua's wisdom, as writing was a specialized skill and not every fellowship enjoyed the services of a scribe. When written accounts of Jesus's teachings began to circulate (i.e., the theoretical "sayings" gospel *Q* and the Semeia or *Signs* source), the independent groups would supplement them with their own traditions about Yeshua, each believing their own versions to be "the Gospel." Eventually, as these expanded writings spread through other communities, some versions were viewed as having more authority than others. It was not until the pronouncement of Bishop Irenaeus (185 C.E.) that Christians began to accept only the four familiar gospels as authoritative, and to refer to them by their modern titles. You may laugh but 4 Gospels were chosen because there were only four winds. That sure sounds like God to me!

The rest of the canon was much slower to develop. For the next two centuries, the four gospels would be coupled with a myriad of different letters, epistles, stories and apocalypses, according to what a particular congregation judged as relevant to their understanding of Yeshua and his message. Catholicism was only one of the dozens of denominations within the early church—Gnosticism was prevalent throughout Egypt, Montanism in Asia Minor, Marconianism in Syria. Eventually, the Catholic church was adopted as the state religion of the Roman Empire, and all other systems of belief were branded as heresies. The West won! Following the Epistle of Athanasius in 367 C.E., the Church finally reached agreement upon which writings were truly authentic and "inspired by God," thus forming the canonical New Testament. Although factions of the Church continued to debate the merits of various books for centuries, and many even used other writings in their liturgy, most uncanonical writings were ordered to be destroyed. In many cases, possession of heretical literature was punishable by death. We are extremely fortunate that many of these texts have survived the millennia, giving us insights into the development of various early Christian traditions. With such a short sketch as to how these "new" documents originated and the authority behind them, any thinking believer should see the necessity to study them in-depth if truth is your goal. Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



DEVELOPMENT OF THE BIBLICAL CANON...A TIMELINE

1000-50 BC:

The Old Testament (hereafter "OT") books are written.

C. 200 BC:

Rabbis translate **ONLY** the first 5 books of the Tanakh (the OT) from Hebrew to Greek, the translation latter called the "Septuagint" (abbreviation: "LXX") would contain the Rabbis translation plus the translation of the rest of the OT done at Alexandria by Hellenized Jews and Hellenized Essenes. The LXX ultimately includes 46 books.

AD 30-100:

Christians use the LXX as their scriptures. This upsets the Jews due to the many discrepancies in the LXX not found in the Jewish Massoretic Text.

C. AD 51-125:

The New Testament books are written, but during this same period other early Christian writings are produced--for example, the Didache (c. AD 70), 1 Clement (c. 96), the Epistle of Barnabas (c. 100), and the 7 letters of Ignatius of Antioch (c. 110).

C. AD 100:

So Jewish rabbis meet at the Council of Jamniah and decide to include in their canon only 39 books, since only these can be found in Hebrew.

C. AD 140:

Marcion, a businessman in Rome, teaches that there were two Gods: Yahweh, the cruel God of the OT, and Abba, the kind father of the NT. So Marcion eliminates the Old Testament as scriptures and, since he is anti-Semitic, keeps from the NT only 10 letters of Paul and 2/3 of Luke's gospel (he deletes references to Jesus' Jewishness). Marcion's "New Testament"--the first to be compiled--forces the mainstream Church to decide on a core canon: the four gospels and letters of Paul.

C. AD 200:

But the periphery of the canon is not yet determined. According to one list, compiled at Rome c. AD 200 (the Muratorian Canon), the NT consists of the 4 gospels; Acts; 13 letters of Paul (Hebrews is not included); 3 of the 7 General Epistles (1-2 John and Jude); and also the Apocalypse of Peter.

AD 367:

The earliest extant list of the books of the NT, in exactly the number and order in which we presently have them, is written by Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, in his Easter letter of 367.

C. AD 400:

Jerome translates the Bible from Hebrew and Greek into Latin (called the "Vulgate"). He knows that the Jews have only 39 books, and he wants to limit the OT to these; the 7 he would leave out (Tobit, Judith, 1 Maccabees, 2 Maccabees, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach [or "Ecclesiasticus"], and Baruch--he calls "apocrypha," that is, "hidden books." But Pope Damasus wants all 46 traditionally-used books included in the OT, so the Vulgate has 46.

AD 904:

Pope Damasus, in a letter to a French bishop, lists the New Testament books in their present number and order.

AD 1536:

Luther translates the Bible from Hebrew and Greek to German. He assumes that, since Jews wrote the Old Testament, theirs is the correct canon; he puts the extra 7 books in an appendix that he calls the "Apocrypha."

AD 1546:

The Catholic Council of Trent reaffirms the canonicity of all 46 books.

AD 1442:

At the Council of Florence, the entire Church recognizes the 27 books, though does not declare them unalterable.

AD 1536:

In his translation of the Bible from Greek into German, Luther removes 4 NT books (Hebrews, James, Jude, and Revelations) from their normal order and places them at the end, stating that they are less than canonical.

AD 1546:

At the Council of Trent, the Catholic Church reaffirms once and for all the full list of 27 books as traditionally accepted.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE ROLE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS AUTHORITY FOR BELIEVERS...YOU BE THE JUDGE #1

In this article I would like to address certain aspects of the formation of The New Testament "Canon."

Before I proceed I would like to share with the readers the view to which I have come after diligently studying the formation of the New Testament Canon over the last fifteen years of Bible Study. First of all the traditional Christian today is not aware how the New Testament was put together. Often I hear many say that the New Testament is infallible and inerrant. Sadly, nothing could be farther from the truth as I will quickly show you. In the absence of a written authority such as the Hebrew Bible which the Jews possessed (consisting of the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings) which verified their faith in God and without a written document to which the anti-Semitic and anti-Judaic early Gentile Church could appeal for their authority in rejecting, altering, and distorting the then existing expression of faith in God as handed down by the Jewish Church in Jerusalem, we find the Gentile Church in the later part of the fourth century making a concerted effort in collecting and editing the then existing documents (gospels and epistles) to suit their man-made theologies. This is quite a mouthful I know, but the facts when examined with an open mind will reveal to the reader the same pictures I saw upon examining the facts for myself. The conclusion is inescapable....that reason and rationalization by Gentile authorities in the early Gentile Church was foundational in the formation and acceptance of man-made religious doctrines which often conflicted and contradicted the then existing expression of faith in God as seen in Judaism and which can be seen went into all the world in the Great Commission in the earliest years of the "church" before Rome's domination. What is startling for the educated Christian to see is how the creation of the New Testament see-sawed back and forth through centuries and a consensus of opinion as to what was to be deemed authoritative for them could not be agreed upon. I have taken special pains in these series of articles to carefully chronicle for you the formation process of the documents to which we have heard our whole life are infallible and inerrant. It is amazing to me, as I am sure it will be for you, after having seen for yourself how these documents were disagreed upon for centuries by church authorities, and then to realize that we have been taught by others not possessing this information that the Holy Spirit somehow led in the selection and canonization of these documents. With this information in this article to which most Christians do not possess, it is impossible to see God Spirit behind such confusion. You will have to be the judge and come to an intelligent decision, but such a decision is impossible without the facts. The facts are not at your disposal.

One last thing. Often when discussing the Bible with others I refer to the contradictions or additions made to the documents by the early Catholic Church. This might be surprising to you but good Study Bibles today like the Companion Bible, and others like it documents the same things to which I refer. Many jump to conclusions that I must be a heretic because I don't believe everything in the New Testament as if "God breathed" as Paul states in 2 Tim. 3:16. The glaring problem to which they fall victim is that the very "scriptures" to which Paul refers in his epistle is the Old Testament and not the New Testament for the majority of the writings and documents which would later become the Catholic Canon were not in existence

when Paul said this. The irony of the whole matter is that rather than I, but others who hold to the infallibility and inerrancy of the New Testament are in reality the heretics, for the facts of the matter discredit their positions. Emotionalism is a poor substitute for truth and facts.

Now, as I close this part of this article, please understand that for me the New Testament is very important in spite of its problems for it is a record of the events surrounding the first advent and ministry of Yeshua as well as revealing how Gentiles become part of God's people through belief in God through Yeshua's ministry. The problems in our New Testaments come not only in the documents which were selected which the early Jewish Church headed by James did not use, and would never dream of calling "Scripture" on par with the Old Testament writings, or which the early Jewish Church disavowed such as some of the epistles written by Paul and others written by others in his name, but the later additions and alterations to these written documents by the anti-Semitic Gentile Church which came in step with the latest Catholic Church Councils and their theological decisions throughout the first several centuries of the Gentile Church are flagrant attempts to de-Judaize the Yeshua's Early Church and the faith which was once given to the saints. The facts concerning the formation of the New Testament Canon tell a different picture from what we have been told by our pastors and denominations, but when examined by an open minded believer whose faith is in God and not in corrupted documents and who desires to please Him, will be forced in honest evaluation to see exactly what I also have discovered. To this we now give our attention.

FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

The word "Canon" literally means "Cane," or "Rod of Measurement." In Christian use it came to mean for the early Gentile Christian Church of the fourth century the "Written Rule of Faith," that is, the list of Original and Authoritative Books that was for them God's Inspired Word. The Canonical New Testament Books were those which came to be generally recognized by the Gentile Churches as the Genuine and Authentic Writings of Apostolic Authority (regardless if they were or not). In other words the link to the Apostles was not always maintained as a criteria for acceptance.

In the days of Christ there was in the literature of the Jew nation a group of Writings called "The Scriptures," now called the Old Testament, which the people commonly regarded as having come from God at Mount Sinai. They called it THE WORD OF G-D. Yeshua himself so recognized it. It was read publicly taught regularly in the synagogues. Acts 15:21, one of many examples, reveals this to us when it records for us

“For Moses (first 5 books of Bible) of old time hath in every city them that preach him, being read in the synagogues every sabbath day.”

Christian Churches, from the very first, accepted these Jewish scriptures as God's Word, and gave them, in their assemblies, same place they had had in the synagogues. It was at this time both Jew and Gentile believers had only one Bible; the Bible used by Yeshua's church!

THE MISTAKE OF THE GENTILE CHURCH - THE CREATION OF TWO BIBLES

As the supposed writings of the Apostles appeared having necessary instruction for both the Messianic Community as well as newly converted Gentile believers, they were added to the readings of Moses in the churches along with these other Jewish Scriptures of the Prophets and Writings, and came to be held in the same sacred regard as the Old Testament by each Gentile Church over time. This is when the tragic mistake occurred by the Gentiles by them equating these writings which

supposedly came from the pen of the Apostles and Paul on par with the writings of Moses and the Prophets. Many will say to that statement that I am wrong in my perspective but they don't have all the facts necessary to understand the succeeding events as a mistake. **What you need to know is that these later writings, the vast majority not from the pen of the Apostles but falsely reported to be such (pseudo-epigrapha), would later be held up with equal authority as did the writings of Moses and the Prophets. Please don't misunderstand my thoughts on this issue. I am not against the reading of the writings of the Apostles or Paul in the churches for Acts 15 declares such readings be done, however, to equate such later writings for sources other than the Apostles with the Torah, or even more, revere them above the writings of Moses and the Prophets as has been done in the creation of a "New" testament, is a grievous error. Dear brothers and sisters in Christ, that is what was done!**

NEW TESTAMENT...BEGINNINGS OF THE CANON

There are hints, both in and outside the New Testament writings themselves that, while the Apostles were yet living, and under their own supervision, collections of their writings began to be made for the Churches, and intended to be read alongside the Old Testament which was at that time considered the ONLY Word of God. The reading of their writings was not understood by the speakers or hearers at that time to be the "Word of God" on par with their existing writings of Moses and the Prophets. The readings of such Apostolic writings to the Gentile Churches is quite understandable since the Gentile audience attending the synagogues had a very limited background in the Bible having from the most-part recently departed from Paganism. Eph. 2:2 addresses the problem quite well:

"Wherein in time past ye (Gentiles) walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience."

Let us also look to Eph. 2:12:

"That at that time ye were without Messiah, being aliens from the commonwealth of Israel, and strangers from the covenants of promise, having no hope, and without God in the world."

In other words the Gentiles were Biblically ignorant. So it was necessary to "tailor" the message of God's love and forgiveness and required obedience to His laws and commandments for all men just for the Gentiles. Again such a decision can be seen in the decision of the Acts 15 Council to write letters and deliver them to the Gentile churches instructing them in matters of faith and practice concerning adherence and obedience to the Laws of Noah for acceptance into the Yeshua Movement.

WHAT REALLY IS "SCRIPTURE?"

- Paul claimed for his Teaching the inspiration of God (I Corinthians 2:7-13; 14:37; 1 Thessalonians 2:13).
- So did the writer of the Book of Revelation (Revelation 1:2).
- Paul or later Pauline writers intended that his Epistles should be read in the Churches (Colossians 4:16; I Thessalonians 5:27; 11 Thessalonians 2:15).
- The Gentile writer of the First Peter wrote that "These Things" might remain in the Church after his departure" (2 Peter 1:15; 3:1-2).

Many look to I Timothy 5:18 where Paul quoted as "Scripture" Deut. 25:4 and particularly the phrase "The laborer is worthy of his reward." Many say that Paul was considering "the laborer is worthy of his reward" as Scripture as he spoke or wrote it. Such a comments reveals their lack of understanding of the teaching methods of the Jewish people in the first century. Anyone familiar with such methods of Jewish instruction would understand such a comment as "rehmez" whereby the speaker is referring backwards to what has already been

said to affirm a principle or teaching. Understanding that the two clauses are separated with an “and,” and adding to that the understanding that Paul, using a midrash on Scriptures such as Lev. 19:13 and Deut. 24:15 we actually see Paul stating a truthful principle in the last part of the verse, but to force the matter and say that Paul was calling what he was saying or writings Scripture does injustice to the actual fact and reveals our lack of understanding of the teaching methods of the Jews.

NOW FOR THE HARD PART...DID PETER REALLY CALL PAUL'S WRITINGS "SCRIPTURE"?

In depth study on my part, as well as others for over 15 years, have led us to the inescapable conclusion that the New Testament writings were never to be understood as Scripture on par with the Old Testament, the Law, the Prophets, or the Writings. I have taken a lot of heat for this from many who have failed to study deeply enough to see the truths to which I bow my knee. Let me exonerate myself and others from the slander of many because we recognize that the ONLY Word of God is the Torah, the Prophets, and the Writings....the Bible Yeshua used.

In many attacks upon myself by other Christians they inevitably get around to quoting Peter where he classes Paul's Epistles with "Other Scriptures" (2 Peter 3:15-16). Taken at face value as read in the English my opponents seem to have a good case...that Peter considered Paul's writings as Scripture.

Answer for yourself: Did the writer of Second Peter intend to say Paul's writings were Scripture? Lets go a little deeper than the English shall we?

2 Pet 3:16 16 As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other scriptures, unto their own destruction. (KJV)

Let us examine the word for “other” in the Greek: First from Thayer's Greek Lexicon:

3062 loipoy- remaining, the rest

- the rest of any number or class under consideration
- with a certain distinction and contrast, the rest, who are not of a specific class or number
- the rest of the things that remain

Notice the ideas of "contrast, distinction from, and not belonging to a specific class. The word carries the idea of separation and not inclusion. Since the word carries the idea of "separation" then the idea of identification of both being contrasted as the "same" is impossible. Thus the verse, instead of saying both Scripture and Pauline writings are "the same" it says just the opposite; they are not the same because one is not in the same "class of documents" as the other. Since there is no doubt that the Jewish Scriptures are "NOT Scripture" then the other must be by definition of the word. Simply said the Pauline writings were not understood in the first century to be on par with the Jewish Scriptures; in fact much in them was vehemently opposed by the Apostles and the Jerusalem Church.

If we are to be truthful to the word used in the New Testament writings of Peter we should now clearly see that he was referring to a group of writings in **CONTRAST** to Paul's writings. No where in the understanding of the word are we to force the precept that both writings [Jewish Scriptures & Pauline literature] are to be considered the “same.” The **contrast** in the intent of the word is very important in this regard. The idea from the word used in the Greek is the contrast of Scripture to

documents "NOT" of the same class..see the definition above!

Notice also the concept within the word to things that “remain.” Inherent in Peter’s idea is a contrast to a fixed set of documents which remain in his day and are identifiable. In referring to “the rest” of something it is apparent that the knowledge of them and their identity are known and the contents of them identifiable. Such cannot be said for the writings which comprise our New Testament today for at the time of Peter’s comments about Paul’s writings the four Gospels had not been written, nor had Hebrews, Revelation, and many other books which are in our Bibles today. What I am saying is that to interpret Peter to mean that Paul’s writings are considered “other Scriptures” is a violation of the truth behind the words. The complete set of writings had to exist and be recognized in order to speak about the “rest” of them which completes the whole of them. Obviously such cannot be said about the documents comprising our New Testaments today as about half of the New Testament had not been written at this time, nor would be it be considered “Scripture” officially until early in the fourth century.

Let us now examine the word for “scripture” from 2 Peter 3:16 as well. Having demonstrated above that the only “set” of existing Scriptures at the time of Peter’s comments to which he referred to the “rest of them” was the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings, let us continue.

The Greek word for “scripture” is as follows as taken from Thayer’s Greek Lexicon:

1124 graphe-

- a writing, a written thing
- the Scripture, used to denote either the book itself, or its contents
- a certain portion or section of the Holy Scripture

Let us never forget that we read the Bible today from hindsight, a terrific advantage today, but also a great liability as I hope to show you. We must understand that it was not until the fourth century that we have an official New Testament Canon. Up until that time we have oral traditions, many varying from place to place which was circulated among the peoples. In times these oral traditions were written down, many varying to some degrees. These were not books by any means, but small parchments or vellum that contained such oral traditions put in writing to preserve them. It would be much later before we would have codexes or books whereby all the writings recovered could be chronicled in somewhat of an order as we are accustomed to day.

Having said that, please understand that when the writer of 2nd Peter referred to “scripture” he was not referring to a “book” as given in the definitions above, but rather the collection of parchments containing references to the oral traditions which had by that time been committed to writing.

At the time Peter spoke what is recorded in 2 Peter 3:16 the canon of the official canon of the New Testament was over 300 years away in the making. He had no idea at all of “other Scriptures” as we understand the concept today. His reference, as determined by the wording, as well as the absence of recognized “Scripture” other than the Law, the Prophets, and the Writing, reveal to us the only conclusion plausible considering the time and the facts...that he was referring to other “written things.”

Let us re-read the verse understanding that the more correct understanding of the word “graphe” would be “written things.”

2 Peter 3:16

As also in all his epistles, speaking in them of these things; in which are some things hard to be understood, which they that are unlearned and unstable wrest, as they do also the other WRITINGS, unto their own

destruction.

As you can now see such an interpretation is just as credible as saying “other Scripture.” To force the translation to say “other Scripture” must necessitate the completed set of New Testament writings be in existence (“the rest”) [which completes the whole]; they dear child of God the vast majority of them were not existence when Peter referred to Paul in 2 Pet. 3:16.

This may be hard for you to swallow, but in the context of 2 Peter 3:16 Peter could easily have been referring to and CONTRASTING Jewish Scriptures (Law, Prophets, Writings) with Paul's “other writings” which were hard to understand and had no intention of calling Paul's writing "Scripture" or hold any notion that Paul's writings were on the par with the Jewish Scriptures.

So, I hope you have seen for yourself that to force the conclusion that “other Scriptures” in English must refer to our New Testament is not only in error, but an impossibility owing to the lack of their existence at the time Peter spoke. Shalom

Answer for yourself: What is the tragic implication of this for the Christian to finally realize?

Simply that our Bibles should be what they always were in the days of Jesus....a collection of the Law, Prophets, and Writings **ONLY and any other such "writings" are secondary to say the least and when these "secondary" writings contradict or conflict with the Law, Prophets, and Writings (as they often do) then they are to be discarded and neglected as spurious documents and frauds. This is a major problem for the New Testament and those who understand the context and wording of 2 Peter 3:16.**



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE ROLE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS AUTHORITY FOR BELIEVERS...YOU BE THE JUDGE #2

The problem is not a small one. I am referring to the authorship of the letters and gospels that are in our New Testaments. Current scholarship builds invincible arguments for the unknown authorship for most of the documents in the New Testament. Tradition, of course, says otherwise. Tradition says that the Apostles, wrote many Letters, having in mind immediate needs of the Churches. I wish that were so but any "knowledgeable and informed" student of the New Testament can discern from both internal and external evidences that Jewish authorship for most of the New Testament is not only improbable but impossible.

As to which Letters were to be preserved for future ages, to believe that God Himself watched over the selection of these letters and made His own choice is to accuse God of being a liar for He says "Learn not the way of the heathen" yet we inherited documents within the New Testament which contain beliefs and doctrines which came straight from heathenism, pagan religions, sun-worship, and not the religion of Yeshua. This is the work of Gentiles and anti-Semites!

I suppose today I am most agitated when I think back to my religious beliefs which were taken directly from the New Testament as we have received it to which later, upon much study, I found to be adulterations of Biblical truth instead of Biblical truth. But without serious and dedicated study I would never have known the truth concerning this New Testament, and neither would you, for we have been lulled asleep to believe in Gentile religious establishment which has changed little since the third century and which effectively began the de-judaization of the faith of Yeshua. Such a legacy has been inherited today as contemporary Christianity to which its adherents know little about the corruption of their faith way back in the third century by Constantine and others. The truth of the matter is that we are expected to believe that God worked through an anti-Semitic and anti-Judaic institution called the Gentile Christian Church to create His replacement for the Hebrew Bible which is today called the "New Testament."

The Church is supposed to be both guard and guarantor of the Scriptures. The Church today has failed to inherit the teachings of Yeshua in an unadulterated state, but they can be retrieved through a diligent study of the Jewish first century church and the doctrines taught by the Apostles in their legacy of Yeshua. If the Gentile Church of the second, third and fourth centuries was corrupted (and if you know anything about Judaism and what a Jew like Jesus believed in the first century then you know this as fact), then so was the canon of Scripture of this same Gentile establishment, because the books they chose and authored stemmed directly from their faith and doctrinal beliefs at that time and again "their" beliefs can be shown to have [originated with solar and astral worship](#). The two are inseparable. If we cannot trust the early Gentile Catholic Church (and we cannot), then we cannot trust the New Testament, which was written, delivered, altered, and preserved by the Gentile Catholic Church as such alterations mirrored the latest decisions by the

Catholic Church Councils.

LETS LOOK AT THE RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEM OF THOSE WHO CHOSE THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS AND DEEMED THEM INSPIRED

Answer for yourself: If you cannot and do not accept the religious belief system as shown below, then why do you read uncritically the documents selected by such people (the New Testament) as if they are inspired and infallible if the religious beliefs and foundational doctrines of the Catholic Church are not?

Answer for yourself: If you find it difficult to believe the Holy Spirit led the early Gentile Catholic Church into "all truth" as evidenced by the following doctrines which Protestantism cannot accept, then how comfortable should we be in ascribing to the Holy Spirit the same accuracy and truth in selecting the documents for the New Testament which unfortunately ultimately replaced the Torah as the Bible for the church?

LIST OF HERESIES AND HUMAN TRADITIONS ADOPTED AND PERPETUATED BY THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH IN THE COURSE OF 1600 YEARS

"And ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Yeshua in John 8:32

Notice:--These dates are in many cases approximate. Many of these heresies had been current in the Church years before, but only when they were officially adopted by a Church council and proclaimed by the pope as dogma of faith, did they become binding on Catholics.

ANY RELIGIOUS DOCTRINE TO BE TRUE MUST CONFORM THE WORD OF G-D...THE OLD TESTAMENT

"To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isaiah 8:20)

Before you read these "beliefs" of the same people who gave us the New Testament... understand that this is the same movement that gave us a NEW BIBLE...which ended up replacing the Bible Yeshua used...the Old Testament as the ONLY authority for the believers in God.

Answer for yourself: As you read the following "religious beliefs" of the same people who gave us the New Testament ask yourself if you can we trust the Holy Spirit to have led them into all truth, and should we trust their collection of writings called the New Testament when they, in several places, contradict Moses and Yeshua? I cannot, and I offer no man apologies. Craig M. Lyons M.Div.

Just understand that when you read the NT, with all its additions and deletions over the early centuries of the Gentile Church, these were the

doctrines behind the men gave us that book!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

HERESIES GIVEN TO US BY THE SAME PEOPLE WHO GAVE US OUR NEW TESTAMENTS...THINK ABOUT THAT!

Can we trust those who gave us such spurious doctrines as those below **Dates to have NOT erred likewise when writing and giving us their documents which we call the New Testament today?**

As you read the following ask yourself where the "leading of the Holy Spirit" is at and then ask yourself if such errors were made...how can we trust their canon...the New Testament?

OF ALL THE HUMAN TRADITIONS taught and practiced by the Roman Catholic Church, which are contrary to the Bible, the most ancient are the prayers for the dead and the sign of the Cross. 310

Both began 300 years after Yeshua.

Wax Candles introduced in church. about 320

Veneration of angels and dead saints. 375

The Mass, as a daily celebration, adopted. 394

The worship of Mary, the mother of Yeshua, and the use of the term, "Mother of God", as applied to her, originated in the Council of Ephesus 431

Priests began to dress differently from the laity 500

The doctrine of Purgatory was first established by Gregory the Great 593

The Latin language, as the language of prayer and worship in churches, was also imposed by Pope Gregory I. 600 years after Yeshua. The Word of God forbids praying and teaching in an unknown tongue (I Cor. 14:9). 600

The Bible teaches that we pray to God alone. In the primitive church never were 600 prayers directed to Mary, or to dead saints. This practice began in the Roman Church (Matt. 11:28; Luke 1:46; Acts 10:25-26; 14:14-18)

The Papacy is of pagan origin. The title of pope or universal bishop, was first 610 given to the bishop of Rome by the wicked emperor Phocas. This he did to spite Bishop Ciriacus of Constantinople, who had justly excommunicated him for his having caused the assassination of his predecessor emperor Mauritis. Gregory 1, then bishop of Rome, refused the title, but his successor, Boniface III, first assumed title pope." Yeshua did not appoint Peter to the headship of the apostles and forbade any such notion. (Lk. 22:24-26; Eph. 1:22-23; Col. 1:18; I Cor. 3:11).

Note:-- Nor is there any mention in Scripture, nor in history, that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was the pope there for 25 years; Clement, 3rd bishop of Rome, remarks that there is no real 1st century evidence that Peter was ever in Rome."

The kissing of the Pope's feet 709

It had been a pagan custom to kiss the feet of emperors. (Read Acts 10:25-26; Rev. 19:10; 22:9).

The Temporal power of the Popes

750

When Pepin, the usurper of the throne of France, descended into Italy, called by Pope Stephen II, to war against the Italian Lombards, he defeated them and gave the city of Rome and surrounding territory to the pope. Yeshua expressly forbade such a thing, and He himself refused wordly kingship.

(Read Matt. 4:8-9; 20:25-26; John 18:38).

Worship of the cross, images and relics was authorized. This was by order of Dowager Empress Irene of Constantinople, who first caused to pluck the eyes of her own son, Constantine VI, and then called a church council at the request of Hadrian I, pope of Rome at that time.

788

Such practice is called simply IDOLATRY in the Bible, and is severely condemned. (Read Ex. 20:4; 3:17; Deut. 27:15; Psalm 115).

Holy Water, mixed with a pinch of salt and blessed by the priest, was authorized

850

The veneration of St. Joseph began

890

The baptism of bells was instituted by Pope John XIV

965

Canonization of dead saints, first by Pope John XV

995

Every believer and follower of Yeshua is called saint in the Bible. (Read Rom. 1:7; I Col. 1:2).

Fasting on Fridays and during Lent were imposed by popes said to be interested in the commerce of fish. (Bull, or permit to eat meat), some authorities say, began in the year 700. This is against the plain teaching of the Bible. (Read Matt. 15:10; I Cor. 10:25; I Tim. 4:1-3).

998

The Mass was developed gradually as a sacrifice; attendance made obligatory in the 11th century.

The celibacy of the priesthood was decreed by Pope Hildebrand, Boniface VII. Yeshua imposed no such rule, nor did any of the apostles. On the contrary, St. Peter was a married man, and St. Paul says that bishops were to have wife and children. (Read I Tim. 3:2,5, and 12; Matt. 8:14-15).

1079

The Rosary, or prayer beads was introduced by Peter the Hermit, in the year 1090. Copied from Hindus and Mohammedans. The counting of prayers is a pagan practice and is expressly condemned by Yeshua (Matt. 6:5-13).

1090

The Inquisition of heretics was instituted by the Council of Verona in the year 1184. Yeshua never taught the use of force to spread his religion.

1184

The sale of Indulgences, commonly regarded as a purchase of forgiveness and a permit to indulge in sin. Christianity, as taught in the Bible, condemns such a traffic and it was the protest against this traffic that brought on the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century.

1190

The dogma of Transubstantiation was decreed by Pope Innocent III, in the year

1215

By this doctrine the priest pretends to perform a daily miracle by changing a wafer into the body of Yeshua, and then he pretends to eat Him alive in the presence of his people during Mass. The Bible condemns such absurdities; for the Lord's Supper is simply a memorial of the death of Yeshua.

Confession of sin to the priest at least once a year was instituted by Pope Innocent III., in the Lateran Council. The Bible commands us to confess our sins direct to God. (Read Psa. 51:1-10; Luke 7:48; 15:21; I John 1:8-9).

1215

The adoration of the wafer (Host), was decreed by Pope Honorius. So the Roman Church worships a God

1220

made by human hands. This is plain idolatry and absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. (Read John 4:24).	
The Bible is forbidden to laymen and placed in the index of forbidden books by the Council of Valencia. Yeshua commanded that the Scriptures should be read by all. (John 5:39; I Tim. 3:15-17).	1229
The Scapular was invented by Simon Stock, and English monk. It is a piece of brown cloth, with the picture of the Virgin and supposed to contain supernatural virtue to protect from all dangers those who wear it on naked skin. This is fetishism.	1287
The Roman Church forbade the cup to the laity, by instituting the communion of one kind in the Council of Constance. The Bible commands us to celebrate the Lord's Supper with unleavened bread and the fruit of the vine. (Read Matt. 26:27; I Cor. 11:26-29).	1414
The doctrine of Purgatory was proclaimed as a dogma of faith by Council of Florence. There is not one word in the Bible that would teach the purgatory of priests.	1439
The doctrine of 7 Sacraments affirmed.	1439
The Ave Maria, part of the last	1508
It was completed 50 years afterward and finally approved by Pope Sixtus V, at the end of the 16th century.	
The Council of Trent, held in the year 1545, declared that Tradition is of equal authority with the Bible. By tradition is meant human teachings. The Pharisees believed the same way, and Yeshua bitterly condemned them, for by teaching human tradition, they nullified the commandments of God. (Read Mark 7:7-13; Col. 2:8; Rev. 22:18).	1545
The apocryphal books were added to the Bible also by the Council of Trent. These books were not recognized as canonical by the Jewish Church. (See Rev. 22:8-9).	1546
The Creed of Pope Pius IV was imposed as the official creed 1560 years after Yeshua and the apostles. True Christians retain the Jewish Holy Scriptures as their creed. Hence their creed is 1500 years older than the creed of Roman Catholics. (Read Gal. 1:8).	1560
The Immaculate Conception of the Virgin Mary was proclaimed by Pope Pius IX. The Bible states that all men, with the sole exception of Yeshua, are sinners. Mary herself had need of a Savior. (Read Rom. 3:23; 5:12; Psalms 51:5; Luke 1:30,46,47).	1834
In the year 1870 after Yeshua, Pope Pius IX proclaimed the dogma of Papal Infallibility.	1870
This is a blasphemy and the sign of the apostasy and of the anti-christ predicted by St. Paul. (Read II Thess. 2:2-12; Rev. 17:1-9; 13:5-8,18). Many Bible students see the number of the beast (Rev. 13:18), 666 in the Roman letters of the Pope's title: "VICARIVS FILII DEI." -- V-5, I-1; C-100, I-1; V-S, I-1; L-50, I-1; I-1; D-500, I-1 -- Total, 666.	
Pope Plus X, in the year 1907, condemned together with "Modernism", all the discoveries of modern science which are not approved by the Church. Pius IX had done the same thing in the Syllabus of 1864.	1907
In the year 1930 Pius XI, condemned the Public Schools	1930
In the year 1931 the same pope Pius XI, reaffirmed the doctrine that Mary is "the Mother of God." This doctrine was first invented by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431. This is a heresy contrary to Mary's own words. (Read Luke 1:46-49; John 2:1-5).	1931
In the year 1950 the last dogma was proclaimed by Pope Pius XII, the Assumption of the Virgin Mary.	1950

Let me say again: If we cannot trust the early Gentile Catholic Church (and we cannot), then we cannot trust the New Testament, which was written, delivered, and preserved by the Gentile Catholic Church as well

CONCLUSION

Answer for yourself: What will be the next "theological" invention? The Roman Church says it never changes; yet, it has done nothing else but invent new doctrines which are contrary to the Bible, and has practiced rites and ceremonies taken bodily from paganism. Some scholars have declared that 75% of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church are of pagan origin.

Note:-- Cardinal Newman, in his book, "The Development of the Christian Religion," admits that ... "Temples, incense, oil lamps, votive offerings, holy water, holidays and season of devotions, processions, blessing of fields, sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure (of priests and monks and nuns), images ... are all of pagan origin..." (Page 359).

HERESIES are those doctrines and practices which are contrary to the Bible. They are also called "human traditions" or "doctrines of men". Both Peter and Paul predicted and warned that in the later times "false teachers" would rise within the Church and bring in "damnable heresies" and "doctrines of devils". (Read II Peter 2:1-3, and I Tim. 3:2-5). Yeshua rebuked the Pharisees, for they transgressed the commandments of God by keeping their traditions. "in vain," He said, "they worship me by keeping for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:3,9).

The real heretics therefore, are the Roman Catholics and the true orthodox are the Evangelical Christians.

BRETHREN! The Word of God commands us to get out of Babylon, saying: "Come out of her, my people, that ye be not partakers of her sins, and that ye receive not of her plagues." (Rev. 18:4). All true Christians will remain faithful to the religion of Yeshua as taught in the Bible, and heed the warning of the Apostle Paul, who said: "But though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." (Gal. 1:8).

Answer for yourself: If you have difficulty in accepting these above heresies as truth, then why do you accept their other beliefs hidden within the New Testament that violate the Laws, the Prophets and the Writings?

Answer for yourself: If you have difficulty in accepting these above heresies as truth, then why do you accept their other beliefs cleverly contained in the New Testament which, without through knowledge of the Old Testament, will not be noticed as fraudulent in simple reading of the New Testament?

Don't look now my Protestant friends because much of what you practice in your church comes from these pagan backgrounds...and most of you are not aware because you have placed faith in a fraudulent document!

The Word of God commands us to get out of Idolatry and pagan expressions of religious faith. All true Christians will remain faithful to the religion of Yeshua as taught in the Bible.....the Jewish Scriptures, and which can still be detected within the New Testament with a little study.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE ROLE OF THE NEW TESTAMENT AND ITS AUTHORITY FOR BELIEVERS...YOU BE THE JUDGE #3

THE EMERGENCE OF THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Many think that the books of our New Testament was at first received and accepted by all. Nothing could be farther from the truth.

In Palestine the New Testament Books that first appeared were the Hebrew Gospel of Matthew, James and possibly Hebrews (there is somewhat doubt about this). In Asia Minor we have first appearing John, Galatians, Ephesians, Colossians 11 Timothy, Philemon, I & II Peter, I & II & III John, Jude, Revelation. In Greece we find I & II Corinthians, Philippians, I & II Thessalonians, and Luke. In Rome we find Titus and in Rome we find Mark, Acts, and Romans.

Palestine, Asia Minor, Greece and Rome were far apart. The Old Testament books had originated within the compass of one country; but the New Testament books in widely separated countries.

The earliest collections of New Testament writings were incomplete. It was not a world of like the world we live in today. Travel and communication were slow and dangerous. What is now a trip few hours would then have required months or years. Printing then was unknown, and the making of copies by hand was slow laborious work. Even more it was an age of persecution, when Christian writings had to be kept hid. And, there were no church councils or conferences, where Christians from distant parts could come together and compare notes on what writings they had, till the days of Constantine. So, naturally, the earliest collections of New

Testament books would **Vary**, in different regions; and the process of reaching unanimity as to what books properly belonged in New Testament was slow.

Beside the "canonical" New Testament books there were many others, both good and fraudulent, as noted in pages that follow: some so fine and valuable that were for a while, in some sections, regarded as Scripture; others, were unadulterated forgeries. The one criterion by which a book was judged before acceptance was whether it was of genuine Apostolic origin. Such investigation was not, in every case easy; especially less known books of a distant region.

QUOTING FROM NEW SOURCES TO JUSTIFY CREDIBILITY

We are privileged today to possess early writings of Gentile Christians whose lives overlapped the lives of the Apostles. These writings are few because of the perishable nature of the writing material, and because it was a period of persecution in which Christian writings were destroyed. But, though few, these "overlapped writings" bear their unimpeachable testimony to the existence in their day of a group of writings deemed "authoritative" by the Gentile Christians. It is these earliest "overlapped" writings which serve as the seedbed for the

rejection of the Law and the Torah, and unfortunately, these writings would come to be regarded as new "Scripture." A Lawless faith (Torahless faith) is always easier to accept than one which presents the responsibilities of God to mankind. The Gentile Church, having slowly abandoned the Law, would gradually accept these new writings as "authoritative." This was to become their "new gospel;" and their writings began to abound in quotations from, or references to, these new replacement writings.

For example:

Clement of Rome, in his Epistle to the Corinthians (A.D. 95 quotes from, or refers to, what was to become Matthew, Luke, Romans, Corinthians, Hebrews. I Timothy, and I Peter.

Polycarp, in his Letter to the Philippians (about A.D. 110), quotes Philippians, and reproduces phrases from nine other of Paul's Epistles and I Peter. He says, "I have letters from you, and from Ignatius. I shall send yours to Syria, as you request; and I am sending letter of Ignatius to you, with others, and the present one of own." This indicates that, in Polycarp's day, Gentile Christians had already begun to gather copies of Christian writings from outside the Torah and consider them authoritative..

FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

- Ignatius, in his Seven Letters, written about A.D. 110, during journey from Antioch to Rome for his martyrdom, quotes from what was later to become the Gospel of Matthew, I Peter, and I John. He cites nine of Paul's Epistles, and his letters bear the reference to the other three Gospels.
- Papias, (A.D. 70-155), a pupil of John, wrote "An Explanation of Lord's Discourses," in which he quotes from John, and records traditions about the origin of Matthew and Mark.
- The Didache, written between A.D. 80 and 120, makes 22 quotations from Matthew with references to Luke, John, Acts, Romans, Thessalonians, I Peter; and speaks of "The Gospel" as a written document.
- The Epistle of Barnabas, written between A.D. 90 and 120, quotes from Matthew, John, Acts, 2 Peter, and uses the expression, "It is written," a formula commonly applied only to Scripture.

Let us stop for a moment and recall what we have already learned: that calling Paul's or another's writings "Scripture" does not make authoritative such writings on par with the Law, the Prophets, or the Writings. So, just because the writer of the Epistle of Barnabas uses a formula ["it is written"] often found in Old Testament Scripture does not make his writings any more "Scripture" than if I used the same formula is this article.

- The Shepherd of Hermas, written about A.D. 100 or 140, the "Pilgrims Progress" of the ancient church, made use of James, with abundant echoes of other New Testament books.
- Tatian, about A.D. 160, made a "Harmony of the Four Gospels," called the "Diatessaron," is said by some as the first evidence that Four Gospels (only because he quoted from only the four out of many Gospels present at the time), and only those four, were generally becoming recognized among the churches. His document would go along way to slide opinion to accept these four only over all the others!
- Justin Martyr, born about the year that John died, in his "Apologies," written about A.D. 140, mentions Revelation, and shows knowledge of Acts and eight Epistles. He calls the Gospels the "Memoirs of the Apostles," and says that they were read in Christian assemblies alternately with the "Prophets." Strangely he never quotes one Gospel by the name of the author to whom it is recognized today; namely because at 150 A.D. the names of these "writings" were yet anonymous thus he can only call them "Memoirs of the Apostles."
- Basilides, a Gnostic heretic who taught in Alexandria in the reign of Hadrian (117-138), and who claimed to have knowledge of secret traditions handed down from the Apostles, in his written efforts to distort accepted Christian teachings, quotes from what would become Matthew, Luke, Romans, I Corinthians, Ephesians, and Colossians as accepted Christian Scriptures.

As you can see such quotations by so many would go a long way in creating a New Scripture!

- Marcion, another heretic (about A.D. 140), in the interest of his heresy, made the first canon of New Testament writings, consisting of Luke, Romans, I and II Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Philippians, Colossians, I & II Thessalonians, and Philemon.
- Irenaeus (A.D. 130-200), a pupil of Polycarp, is the first to quote most of New Testament books (180 A.D.) as "Scripture," which, in his time, had come to be known as "The Gospel and the Apostles," as the Old Testament books were called "The Law and the Prophets". In reality it took almost 200 years for these New Testament documents to be "called" Scripture and recognized as such by a few. In time many will follow suit.
- Tertullian (A.D. 160-220), of Carthage, living while the original manuscripts of the Epistles were still in existence, speaks of the Christian Scriptures as the "New Testament" (which title first appears in the writing of an unknown author about A.D. 193). In Tertullian's existing writings there are 1800 quotations from New Testament books. In his work "Against Heretics" he says:

"If you are willing to exercise your curiosity profitably in business of your salvation, visit the Apostolic churches in which the very chairs of the Apostles still preside in their places; in which the very authentic Epistles are read, sounding forth the voice and representing the countenance of each of them. Is Achaia near you? You have Corinth. If you are not far from Macedonia, you have Philippi and Thessalonica. If you can go to Asia, you have Ephesus. If are near Italy, you have Rome."

- The Muratorian Fragment, made in Rome, about A.D. 170, rains a list of the Christian Scriptures. It omits Hebrews, I and II Peter, and James; but includes the Book of Wisdom and Apocalypse of Peter.
- The Old Syriac Version, made about the middle of the second century A.D. omits James, I & II Peter, I, II, & III John, Jude, and Revelation.
- The Old Latin Version, made about the middle of the second century A.D. omits Hebrews, James, and II Peter.
- Origen (185-254). of Alexandria, a Christian scholar of extensive travel and great learning, devoted his life to the study of Scripture. He wrote so extensively that at times he employed as many as twenty copyists. In his existing writings 2/3 of the New Testament can be found in quotations. He accepted the 27 books of the New Testament as we have them, though not sure of authorship of Hebrews, and expressed doubt as to James, II Peter, and II & III John.

SO WHAT BOOKS WERE TO BE CONSIDERED THE NEW TESTAMENT?

From the above citations, and that of Eusebius (on the page following), it will be seen that, for a while, there was great variation by many as to what books were regarded as canonical.

There are two answers to this perplexing problem since we believe the Holy Spirit has promised to guide us into all truth. The evidence is factual....the greatest minds of the early Gentile Christian movement were not in unity about which books were to be included in the Gentile Canon. It would seem to me that if God desired to have a New Testament with an authority equal to the Torah this should not have been for "with God all things are possible." Many say to me "God oversees His Word" and to this I wholeheartedly agree. But what is to be "His Word?"

There are others who try to get around the above obvious failure of the Holy Spirit for almost 400 years to come to unity upon the selection of books which were to be the foundation of this Gentile Christian movement. Many try to explain this obvious embarrassment by saying such disunity and agreement upon the selection of books for the New Testament Canon was due simply to the fact that account of slow means of communication over the vast expanse of the Roman Empire, and on account of three hundred years of incessant and unrelenting persecution, there was not one single chance for the churches to make a fair and open

and reasonable effort to come to general unanimity as to what books were of genuine Apostolic Authority, till Constantine, at the beginning of the 4th Century, issued his Edict of Toleration.

Answer for yourself: Can God witness the same truth to two different people at the same time although they live in two different places?

There is your answer. Of course God can, but He didn't! This means that the selection of the canon by the Gentile Christian church was more dependent upon reasoning and rationalization based upon pre-formed theologies than any inspiration from God. This may be hard to swallow, but face the facts. The juxtaposition of books repeatedly in the canon and out of the canon, the inclusion of some to the exclusion of others, and the final decision as to which was to be included as made over hundreds and hundreds of years brings great difficulty to assigning any credibility for the selection of such books that comprise our New Testament today.

Now, please understand, I both preach and teach from these document, but not to the exclusion of the Torah, nor do I ascribe to them the authority I do to the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings, and neither should you. For me, and others at Bet Emet, the New Testament is considered as Midrash, as commentary upon the life and times of Jesus. When materials within the New Testament line up with the Old Testament we have a witness to truth, but when teachings and doctrines within the New Testament diverge and contradict the Torah, then they are lies included among truth and the unscrupulous custodians of these documents (the anti-Semitic and anti-Judaic Gentile Catholic Church of the earliest centuries) are to be exposed for what they are in God's sight....shameless beings who corrupted the Word of God by adding to and taking away from it! Such parts of the New Testament are to be rejected by the Christians today. The hard part is to discern what parts of the New Testament are fraudulent. Without capable and dedicated study on your part you will never know. But the good news for you is that there are in the Body of Christ today capable men and women, and ministries, devoted to recovering the truths about the real Yeshua and educating the Body of Christ to these truths in hopes that our obedience before God will be more pleasing. Such is our love for God and should be yours as well.

THE DOUBTFUL BOOKS

We must understand that such books were not "doubtful" in regions where they first appeared. The isolation of communities from others contributed to these books not becoming widely known for a while. The fact that they were slow in being generally received is a testimony to the carefulness of the churches against impostors.

FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...MORE

Eusebius (A.D. 264 340), bishop of Caesarea, Church Historian, live through, and was imprisoned during Diocletian's persecution of Christians, which was Rome's final effort to blot out the Christian name. One of its special objects was the destruction of all Christian Scriptures. For ten years Bibles were hunted by the agents of Rome and burned in public market places. To Christians, the question of just what books composed their Scriptures was no idle matter.

Eusebius lived into the reign of (Constantine, who accepted Christianity. Eusebius became Constantine's chief religious adviser. One of Constantine's first acts on ascending the throne was to order, for the churches of Constantinople, fifty Bibles, to be prepared, under the direction of Eusebius, by skillful copyists, on the finest of vellum and to be delivered by royal carriages from Caesarea to Constantinople. He wrote, in his order to Eusebius:

"I have thought it expedient to instruct your Prudence to order fifty copies of the Sacred Scriptures, the provision and use of which you know to be most needful for the instruction of the church, to be written on

prepared parchment, in a legible manner, and in a commodious and portable form, by transcribers thoroughly practiced in their art. You have authority also, by virtue of this letter to use two of the public carriages for their conveyance; by which arrangement' the copies, when fairly written, will most easily be forwarded for my personal inspection. One of the deacons of your church may be entrusted with this service, who, on his arrival here shall experience my liberality. God preserve you, beloved brother”.

SO WHAT WAS THE NEW TESTAMENT TO EUSEBIUS?

It may surprise you to know that by the later part of the fourth century the same books that now constitute the New Testament was also for Eusebius the same.

Eusebius, by extensive research, made himself informed as to what books had been generally accepted by the churches. In his Church History he speaks of four classes of books:

1. **Those universally accepted.**
2. **The "disputed" books:** James, II Peter, Jude, II & III John, which, though included in his own Bibles, were still doubted by some.
3. **The "spurious" books:** among which he mentions the "Acts of Paul," "Shepherd of Hermas," "Apocalypse of Peter," "Epistle of Barnabas" and the "Didache."
4. **The "Forgeries of heretics":** among which he grouped "Gospel of Peter," "Gospel of Thomas," "Gospel of Matthias," "Acts of Andrew," and "Acts of John."

The Council of Carthage (A.D. 397), gave its formal ratification to the 27 books of the New Testament as we know them, expressing what had already become the unanimous judgment of the churches and accepted for itself THE BOOK that was destined to be MAN'S MOST PRECIOUS HERITAGE.

MODERN BIBLICAL CRITICISM..WHAT DOES IT MEAN CORRECTLY?

The Bible, with its 27-book New Testament canon, as accepted by the Early Christian Fathers, and finally ratified by the Council of Carthage, became, without further questioning, the recognized of Christendom for a thousand years.

With the rise of the modern critical spirit came a renewed investigation into the origin and authenticity of the Bible books, as with all ancient books.

"Criticism," as applied to the Bible, is a rather unfortunate term although with many irreverent wisecracks it has been exactly that, in-somuch that the word is quite commonly regarded as being the name of the modern intellectual effort to undermine the Divine Authority of the Bible. So far as the word means critical and fair examination of facts, or alleged facts, in an honest search for historical truth is natural, reasonable and legitimate, and enlarges our knowledge of the Scripture.

Historical Criticism has to do with the genuineness authenticity of the Bible books: that is, who wrote each book when, and whether the book is historical or otherwise.

In relation to the New Testament books, it is merely the re-opening of the question settled by, and to the satisfaction of first Generations of Christian fathers. Modern critics have made no more determined nor scholarly effort to ascertain the genuineness of the New Testament books than was made by the generations in which the books were first published. Indeed they were in far better position to determine the nature of those books than later critics. It is not easy to wreck a train long after it has gone by. Literary forgeries are soon detected. Whether a book is historical or fictional is recognized on publication. If I were to write a history of the American Revolutionary War, and sign George Washington's name to it, could I make anybody believe that

Washington wrote it?

One of the unfortunate things about the critics who have discarded the traditional view of the origins of the Bible books is their presumption to themselves of a monopoly of "scholarship." To them their view is the "unanimous opinion of scholarship." Are they so narrow-minded as to think that only those who hold to their theories are true scholars? Viewpoint is not an indication of scholarship, but only of one's mindset and is not always dependent upon facts. The dear Old Book has worn out many anvils, long after the critics have been forgotten will go marching on loved and honored by unnumbered millions.

Textual Criticism is the comparison of various manuscripts to ascertain the exact original text from which they are copied. It has resulted in the Old Testament Masoretic Hebrew and New Testament Westcott and Hort Greek texts, which, in the main, are the exact original Bible words. Printing removed the danger of textual errors.

APOCRYPHAL NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS

These are legendary and spurious Gospels, Acts of the Apostles and Epistles, which began to appear in the 2nd Century. They were mostly forgeries, and were so recognized from the first. They are so full of nonsensical stories of Christ and the Apostles, that they have never been regarded as divine, nor bound in our Bible. Deliberate attempts to fill the gaps of the New Testament story of Yeshua in order to further heretical ideas by false claims abound within them.

There are known to have been about 50 of the spurious "Gospels" besides many "Acts" and "Epistles." The great mass of these for writings made it very important for the Early Church to distinguish between the false and the true.

It is said that Mohammed got his ideas of Christianity largely from these books. They are the origin of some of the dogmas of the Roman Catholic Church.

They are not to be confused with the writings of the "Apostolic fathers."

HERE IS A LIST OF SOME OF THE MOST WELL KNOWN

- Gospel of Nicodemus embodies the "Acts of Pilate," an alleged official report of the trial of Yeshua to Emperor Tiberius. It was produced in the 2 or 5th century and is purely imaginary.
- Protevangelium of James is a narrative from the birth of Mary to the slaughter of the innocents. It contains stories that had begun to circulate in the 2nd century through the 5th century.
- The Passing of Mary abounds in silly miracles, and culminates in the removal of "her spotless and precious body" to Paradise. It was written the 4th century, with the rise of Virgin worship.
- The Gospel according to the Hebrews is classified as an Apocryphal New Testament book, yet is one of the oldest surviving Gospels used by the original Jewish Church. It contains additions to the canonical Gospels with some alleged sayings of Yeshua and dates around A.D. 100.
- The Gospel of the Ebionites is compiled from the synoptic Gospels and dates from the early second through the fourth century. This Gospel has been rejected by Gentile Christianity today because it adheres to an earlier Christology that was later rejected by the Gentile Church Councils which took an opposite view of Christology.
- The Gospel of the Egyptians contains imaginary conversations between Yeshua and Salome. It is dated between A.D. 130 and 150 and was used by the Sabellians.
- The Gospel of Peter is dated around the middle of 2nd century and is based on the canonical Gospels and is written in the interest of Anti-Jewish and Docetic doctrines.
- The Gospel of Pseudo-Matthew is a 5th century forged translation of Matthew which is abounding with the childhood miracles of Yeshua.
- The Gospel of Thomas is a 2nd century document that records for us Yeshua's life from the 5th to the

12th year and makes him a miracle worker to satisfy boyish whims.

- The Nativity of Mary is a deliberate forgery of 6th century intended to further the worship of the Virgin Mary. Stories about daily visits of angels to Mary and with Papal growth has become immensely popular.
- The Arabic Gospel of the Childhood is a 7th century document containing stories of miracles during the sojourn in Egypt and is extremely fantastic.
- The Gospel of Joseph the Carpenter is a 4th century document that originated in Egypt and is devoted to the glorification of Joseph.
- The Apocalypse of Peter contains the purported visions of heaven and hell given to Peter. It was called "spurious" by Eusebius.
- The Acts of Paul from the middle of 2nd century is a romance inculcating continence. It is said to contain the supposed lost Epistle to the Corinthians.
- The Acts of Peter is written at the end of 2nd century and describes a love affair of Peter's daughter. Within it is conflict with Simon Magus (a synonym for Paul). It also contains the "Quo vadis" story.
- The Acts of John at the end of 2nd century is a story of a visit to Rome that is purely imaginary. It contains a revolting picture of sensuality.
- The Acts of Andrew contains the story of Andrew persuading Maximilla to refrain from intercourse with her husband, resulting in his martyrdom.
- The Acts of Thomas at the end of 2nd century is like the Acts of Andrew in that it is a travel-romance, in interest of abstinence from sexual intercourse.
- The Letter of Peter to James at the end of 2nd century is a violent attack of Paul by the early Jewish Church (Ebionites) for his relaxation of the Torah in his mission to the Gentiles.
- The Epistle from Laodicea professes to be the one referred to in Colossians 4:16. A lot of Paul's phrases are strung together in this epistle.
- The Letters of Paul to Seneca, with Letters from Seneca to Paul is believed to be a 4th century forgery. The intent is either to commend Christianity to the followers of Seneca, or to commend Seneca to Christians.

The main characteristic of these writings is that most, but not all, are fiction representing itself as history, but for the most part they are utterly absurd that their falsity is self-evident. But that cannot be said for all. For example the Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of the Hebrews are exceptions which others have grouped as Apocryphal Gospels, yet they contain historical and theological truths.

- The Abgarus Letters may have some basis of fact. Eusebius thought so. He relates that Abgarus, king of Edessa, sick, heard of Yeshua's power, and wrote a letter begging Yeshua to come and heal him to which Yeshua wrote an answer: "It is necessary that those things for which I was sent should be completed, after which I shall be received up to Him who sent me. When, therefore, I shall be received in heaven, I will send one of my disciples who shall heal you." Accordingly, Thaddeus is said to have been sent, and was shown the letters in the archives of Edessa. Possibly Yeshua may have sent such a message verbally, which they recorded.

WRITINGS OF THE APOSTOLIC FATHERS

These should not be confused with the false books, enumerated on the two preceding pages, in which the authors assumed names of Apostles to give credence to legendary tales.

The Apostolic Fathers (more exactly, the "Sub-Apostolic Fathers") were those whose lives overlapped the Apostolic generation. Their extant writings are few (how we wish there were more of them!) due to the perishable nature of their writing material, and to the persecutions of their day.

But they are extremely valuable, as they form the connecting link between the Apostles and later Church History. Some of them were so highly regarded that, in some localities, they were temporarily regarded as Scripture.

- **The Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians in A.D. 95 is one such letter. Clement was a bishop of Rome (AD. 91-100) and was a companion of Paul and Peter. He must have been acquainted with John as well. He wrote this Epistle the year that John was banished to Patmos. It is said that he was condemned to the mines, and suffered martyrdom in the 3rd year of Trajan. He is thought, possibly, to have been the Clement mentioned in Philippians 4:3.**

This Epistle was occasioned by a division in the Corinthian church in which some Elders were excluded by younger worldly men. It was written in the name of the Roman church, and is full of beautiful exhortations to humility, and dwells much on the resurrection. It was so highly esteemed that it was read publicly in many churches down to the 4th century. It was found, at the end of the New Testament in the Alexandrian manuscript of the Bible.

- **The Epistle of Polycarp to the Philippians is dated about A.D. 110. Polycarp was the pupil of John, bishop of Smyrna, and he wrote a number of letters, but the only one is extant. It was in reply to a letter from the Philippians asking his advice. It reads very much like Paul's Epistles, which he commends to their careful study.**
- **The Epistles of Ignatius was written about A.D. 110. Ignatius was a pupil of John and bishop of Antioch. He suffered martyrdom in Rome A.D. 110. On his way from Antioch to Rome, passing through Asia Minor, he wrote Seven Epistles: To the Ephesians, Magnesians, Trallians, Philadelphians, Smyrnaeans, Romans and Polycarp. These Epistles of Ignatius abound in tender exhortations, and breathe a spirit of rejoicing at the prospect of his impending martyrdom. They emphasize the evil of heresy and division, and counsel submission to the elders of the church.**
- **The Epistle of Barnabas was written between A.D. 90 and 120. Some think it was the New Testament Barnabas, but others question it. The Epistle is a General Epistle, addressed to all Christians, containing a sort of outline interpretation of Scripture. It was found in the Sinaitic manuscript of the Bible, at the end of New Testament, which indicates the high regard in which it was held.**
- **The Papias' Fragments was written by Papias, a pupil of John and bishop Hierapolis. He was martyred about same time as Polycarp. He wrote "Explanation of the Lord's Discourses," which was extant down to the 13th century. But now only fragments remain in quotations in Irenaeus, Eusebius and others.**
- **The Didache, or Teaching of the Twelve was written between 80 and 120, probably about A.D. 100. It is not a genuine composition of the Apostles, but only a statement, by some unknown author, of what he understood those teachings to be. It resembles the Epistle of James. Early writers denied its canonicity, but held it in high regard. It abounds in quotations from New Testament books.**
- **The Shepherd of Hermas was written about A.D. 100 or 140. It is the earliest example of Christian Allegory, the "Pilgrim's Progress" of the primitive Church. The writer was intensely religious, and saw visions which he wrote in this book, emphasizing repentance, spiritual life, and the near Advent of the Lord. The book was read in many churches down to the time of Jerome. It is contained in the Sinaitic manuscript of the Bible, at the close of the New Testament. That the author was the Hermas of Romans 16:14 is only a guess.**
- **The Apology of Aristides was written by a philosopher of Athens. He wrote "Defense of Christianity," to Hadrian, A.D. 125, and to Antonius, A.D. 137, appealing for protection of Christians against persecution. He said, "Blessed is the race of Christians above all men, because of their true and noble creed, and their pure and benevolent lives." It is the earliest known literary tribute of a philosopher to Christianity. It was written from Athens, the home of philosophy.**
- **Justin Martyr (A.D. 100 167) was a philosopher, who, after trying Stoic, Peripatetic, Pythagorean, and Platonic philosophies, found satisfaction in Christianity. He wrote "Apologies," addressed to the Emperor Antoninus, in defense of Christianity. He also wrote a "Dialogue with Trypho," which was an argument with a Jew over the Messiahship of Yeshua. This is the first real good example of Gentile replacement religion.**
- **The II Epistle of Clement was written between A.D. 120 and 140. It is written in the form of a sermon. Again, we are uncertain if it was the same Clement.**
- **The Epistle of Diognetus is a vindication of Christianity, by an unknown author who claimed he was "a disciple of the Apostles."**

Answer for yourself: Could God be sharing important things intended for us in writings such as these, but which were unfortunately rejected by the Gentile Catholic Church when they collected writings that promoted their own Gentile replacement theology of the time? Shalom.



20%^{off}

COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**

APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



HAVE YOU EVER NOTICED THAT "QUOTES" FROM THE OLD TESTAMENT USED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT...ARE NOT IN THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES AT ALL?

If you were like me most likely you grew up in a Christian Church where you were taught over and over that the Scriptures in the New Testament are infallible and inerrant. We were given Apostle Paul's attestation to this very fact in Second Timothy 3:16: "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness." Of course Paul was referring only to the Old Testament Jewish Scriptures with that verse since most of the New Testament had not been written yet, but who was to object if it was taken to refer to the New Testament. For after all, most "assume" that the Bible that they carry to church Sunday after Sunday could not be filled with "errors, misquotations, mistranslations, and purposeful misapplications of Old Testament passages in their New Testament"....do they?

Answer for yourself: How "righteous" is it when you purposely deceive others?

Answer for yourself: How valuable are documents reported to of importance for religious doctrine when these documents can be shown to be full of purposeful misquotations of the original sources (the Jewish Scriptures)?

Answer for yourself: How can we trust such misquotations for "reproof and correction" when themselves are diametrically opposed to the original teachings they are supposed to validate?

Answer for yourself: Do you realize that if you follow a fraudulent document full of misquotations and mistranslations for your religious belief system then in reality what you choose to "believe" and "do" are in reality 180 degrees opposite to both what God said and desired for you to both know and do?

Answer for yourself: Were you aware that many supposed "quotations" in the New Testament are not quotations at all, but rather Gentile creations that serve their anti-Semitic propaganda as espoused by Rome?

Let us look into the matter.

I challenge anyone to find where these supposed "quotations" exist in the Jewish Scriptures when taken in the same context and wording as used by the original writer. Let us remember that these "supposed quotations," are non-quotations. These "non-quotations" are read unfortunately as inspired Scripture which they are not. The Holy Spirit does not make such mistakes but men not inspired of God do and we have their record of such event in the New Testament. These false quotations served the purpose to make us belief doctrines which were foreign to the Jewish Scriptures which were given by God

WE ALL AGREE TO THIS...DON'T WE?

You must agree that since the New Testament bases its validity off the Old Testament; this means that the Jewish Scriptures are taken as truth by Christians and thus cannot be wrong. But that cannot be said for the New Testament passages if they contradict the original passages or misquote them. Again, this cannot be said for Christian Bibles which misquote and mistranslate the Hebrew of the Jewish Bibles in the Christian Bible's Old Testament. I always knew for some time now the problems inherent in the New Testament, but was utterly amazed to find how the KJV Bible was just as guilty of misrepresentation of the Jewish Old Testament in their "translations" of it in the Christian Bibles as well.

We cannot trust either the OT or the NT in our Christian Bibles unless we compare the NT with the Jewish Bible as well as compare the OT in the Christian Bible with the Jewish Old Testament in the Jewish Bible. Then and only then can we be assured we have the truth

Once you embark on this type of study you will be amazed at how many quotations by Paul are anything but true quotations. Thus, we need to check out Paul and his teachings very closely because often they are opposite to what Yeshua both said and taught.

EXAMINING THE EVIDENCE...JUST A FEW EXAMPLES...THEY ARE TOO NUMEROUS TO COVER IN ONE ARTICLE

1 Timothy 1:18

18. This charge I commit unto thee, son Timothy, according to the prophecies which went before on thee, that thou by them mightest war a good warfare;

Answer for yourself: Have you ever read in the Jewish Scriptures prophecies concerning Timothy?

There are no Old Testament prophecies pertaining to Timothy.

Ephesians 5:14

14 Wherefore he saith {it is said -- {RSV}}, Awake thou that sleepest, and arise from the dead, and Christ shall give thee light.

Most Christians commentators refer to two Jewish Scriptures for reference for Paul's comment. We are told to believe that in the Jewish Scriptures, in Isa. 60:1 and 26:19 we have the reference to which Paul alludes in referring to the resurrection of Yeshua. Let us investigate these two passages and see if they refer to Yeshua's resurrection.

Isaiah 60:1

Arise, shine; for thy light is come, and the glory of the Lord is risen upon thee.

In this passage the Prophet Isaiah foresees a time when Israel will arise out of her darkness and shine with God's glory and not the resurrection of a person.. Then the Gentile will come to the light of Israel and her Torah. Thus the sons of the strangers described in this chapter will come to Jerusalem to worship the Lord. The context of Isaiah is a national revival and has nothing to do with the resurrection of a body.

Isaiah 26:19

Thy dead men shall live, together with my dead body shall they arise. Awake and sing, ye that dwell in the dust: for thy dew is as the dew of herbs, and the earth shall cast out the dead.

The context of this verse is the general resurrection of all the dead as alluded to in Daniel 12:2 and not to a resurrection of a man prior to the consummate event of all eschatology. This is an event which is to transpire at the end of days and not 2000 years earlier in Yeshua's resurrection. Daniel refers to two resurrections, one of the righteous dead to everlasting life and another of the unrighteous to everlasting contempt. A traditional Christian dispensationalist will tell you that these two resurrections are separated by the one-thousand year reign of Christ. Again the meaning of the Jewish Scripture used from Isaiah by Paul has a context totally foreign to thy way Isaiah originally intended. Paul used the passage from Isaiah and gave it a totally different meaning. Such is a misquotation of the passage in which the original context of the author was distorted.

1 Corinthians 15:4

4 And that he was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures: 5 And that he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve: 6 After that, he was seen of above five hundred brethren at once; of whom the greater part remain unto this present, but some are fallen asleep.

Answer for yourself: Where in the Gospels does it say that Peter saw Yeshua before the other apostles?

No gospel says that Peter (Cephas) saw Yeshua before the 12 or saw Yeshua 1st after the resurrection.

Answer for yourself: Where in the Gospels does it say that 500 people saw Yeshua after he was raised from the death?

No gospel says 500 people saw Yeshua after the resurrection. But more troubling than that is that such a dramatic occurrence, which would have easily brought the religious establishment to their knees, is totally without corroboration outside of this single reference by Paul.

Answer for yourself: In 1 Corinthians 15:4 Paul says that Yeshua was buried, and that he rose again the third day according to the scriptures.

Answer for yourself: Where in the Jewish Scriptures is the death of Yeshua predicted with his resurrection foretold for 3 days later?

It simply is not there. Paul is speaking as if the Jewish Scriptures prophesied of Yeshua's death and resurrection 3 days later and such a statement is not true.

Hebrews 10:5

It is debatable that Paul is the author of the book of Hebrews. But for the sake of argument let us say he is at the moment.

5 Wherefore when he cometh into the world, he saith, Sacrifice and offering thou wouldest not, but a body hast thou prepared me: 6 In burnt offerings and [sacrifices] for sin thou hast had no pleasure.

The above passage is a quotation from Psalms 40:6..

Answer for yourself: Does the book of Hebrews, believed to be inspired and infallible by millions of believers today, quote accurately Psalm 40:6?

Notice the difference for yourself

As taken from the Hebrew text of Psalm 40:6 we find something rather startling that contradicts the inspired writings of Hebrews.

6. Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire; mine ears hast thou opened (in order to hear the Torah of God): burnt offering and sin offering hast thou not required.

Answer for yourself: How does "mine ears has thou opened" become "a body Thou has prepared for me?"

Answer for yourself: Does Paul quote Psalm 40:6 correctly in Hebrews 10:5? No way.

Paul misapplies or misquotes (or someone later to his letters) Psalms 40:6. "A body hast thou prepared me" is not in Psalms. Paul omits "mine ears hast thou opened". Nowhere in the New Testament did Yeshua say these things either.

Romans 2:24

24 For the name of God is blasphemed among the Gentiles through you, as it is written.

Again the context of the quote is totally foreign to the way Paul used the quote. Quoting from Isa. 52:5 we find that the name of God was blasphemed by the Gentiles who took captive the Jewish nation when all the while their God was to be their defender. God was mocked by the heathen because of the plight of the Jewish people What the heathen failed to understand is that such captivity was a punishment upon the Jewish people and not indicative of the impotence of God in protecting and saving His people.

In Romans we are led to believe that the name of God was blasphemed again by the Gentiles because the Jews don't keep the Law. Such is ludicrous, and Paul tells a lie because any casual attempt to study the first century will show the dedication of Pharisees, Sadducees, and Essenes to scrupulously keep the Law. That was one of Yeshua's problems with the religions establishment... they neglected the weightier matters of the Torah due to preoccupation of the nuances of the Oral Law. They strained at a gnat and swallowed a camel.

Matthew 12:5

5 Or have ye not read in the law, how that on the sabbath days the priests in the temple profane the sabbath, and are blameless?

Nowhere does the Old Testament state that priests in the temple profaned the sabbath, and are blameless.

Matthew 23:35

35 That upon you may come all the righteous blood shed upon the earth, from the blood of righteous Abel unto the blood of Zacharias son of Barachias, whom ye slew between the temple and the altar.

This may come as a shock to you but the name Barachias is not in the Old Testament In the Old Testament Zacharias is the son of Jehoida, not Barachias as it is shown in 2 Chron. 24:20-22.

Matthew 26:56

56 But, all this was done, that the scriptures of the prophets might be fulfilled. Then all the disciples forsook him, and fled.

This event, the forsaking of Yeshua at his crucifixion, is not in the Jewish Old Testament at all.

Mark 1:2

2 As it is written in the prophets {in Isaiah, the prophet -- RSV}, Behold, I send my messenger before thy face, which shall prepare thy way before thee.

No such statement exists in Isaiah or the Old Testament.

Mark 9:13

13 But I say unto you, That Elias is indeed come, and they have done unto him whatsoever they listed, as it is written of him.

There are no predictions in the Old Testament of things that were to happen to Elias.

Luke 24:46

46 And said unto them, Thus it is written, and thus it behoved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day:

Nothing is written in the Old Testament about Yeshua as the Christ rising from the dead, especially on the 3rd day.

John 1:45

45 Philip findeth Nathaniel, and saith unto him, We have found him, of whom Moses in the law, and the prophets, did write, Yeshua of Nazareth, the son of Joseph.

This will be hard for you to deal with but I have come to the conclusion that none of the Old Testament prophets nor Moses wrote about Yeshua "personally" but only about the Messiah. We as Christians have been conditioned over the years, due to hearing poor teaching by our leadership, to read into the text prior beliefs espoused by this or that denomination about Yeshua. We can read anything into the text if we violate the laws of interpretation. That is what I am trying to say and warn the Christian community. You can say "this" or "that" refers to Yeshua, but for the document called the Old Testament to hold credibility is has to stand up to the same criteria of interpretation that the New Testament is held to. That means before you apply a text to Yeshua as a "fulfillment" there has to be a prior "peshat" interpretation. There are four levels of Biblical interpretation for Jewish literature. First we have the "peshat" or the literal and plain ordinary meaning. If Yeshua did not in his life accomplish the same exact event, then any reference to fulfilling a previous prophecy is ludicrous. We must not take out of the original context of the writer events and try to apply them to Yeshua. If God is behind it He does not need our help to "fudge" to make it fit. Before you have any allegorical or metaphorical interpretation we must again have the literal and real event (peshat). If said event is missing literally from Yeshua's life or can be proven less than authentic, then all the allegorical allusion is worthless. Next if there is to be any mystical interpretation to the events in Yeshua's life as fulfillment of Scripture then again the literal-plain ordinary event must be demonstrable without twisting the facts to make it fit our pre-formed theologies about Yeshua. I know this is hard, but necessary if you want the truth. Again this is startling for most but if you have read these articles up to now just remember how we have exposed error after error taught as truth. I guess I should understand that of utmost importance for most is if Yeshua is Messiah. Time will tell. When Messiah comes and fulfills the prophecies of the Prophets and Moses we can ask him his name and

if he has been here before. Due to the overwhelming forgeries within the New Testament and the lack of actual "peshat" fulfillment of the prophecies of Moses and the Prophets we must await the coming of Messiah to 100% be certain of his identity.

John 7:38

38 He that believeth on me, as the scripture hath said, out of his belly shall flow rivers of living water.

Again this passage is not to be found anywhere in the Old Testament. It is not in Isa. 44:3, Isa 55:1, Ezek. 47:1, and Isa 58:11.

John 20:9

9 For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead.

There is no Old Testament statement that Yeshua must rise from the dead, or that Yeshua must rise again.

Acts 20:35

35 I have shewed you all things, how that so labouring ye ought to support the weak, and to remember the words of the Lord Yeshua, how he said, It is more blessed to give than to receive.

To the best of recorded knowledge at present, Yeshua did not say "It is more blessed to give than to receive."

Hebrews 11:35

35 Women received their dead raised to life again: and others were tortured, not accepting deliverance; that they might obtain a better resurrection:

Nowhere in the Old Testament does it say that people suffered torture because they expected to rise again to a better life.

James 4:5

5 Do ye think that the scripture saith in vain, The spirit that dwelleth in us lusteth to envy?

No such statement is recorded in the Old Testament; not Gen. 6:5, 11; 8:21; Prov 21:10 and Eccles 4:4)

In Jewish custom there is what they call a 'durash' where you deliberately misquote, or make up something in scripture in order to prove a point. But of course you can immediately see how problematic such an explanation would be.

A durash is a quotation from the Old Testament which is quoted out of context, misquoted, or doesn't exist. It is still used sometimes by orthodox Jews for teaching along with a parable. It is usually introduced by the phrase "Thus it was fulfilled that which was spoken by ... As it is written in the scriptures ... As the scriptures say ... etc."

Matthew 27:8

Wherefore that field was called, The field of blood, unto this day. 9 Then was fulfilled that which was spoken by Jeremy the prophet, saying, And they took the thirty pieces of silver, the price of him that was valued, whom they of the children of Israel did value; 10 And gave them for the potter's field, as the Lord appointed me.

(Jeremiah is misquoted)

Matthew 3:3

For this is he that was spoken of by the prophet Esaias, saying, The voice of one crying in the wilderness, Prepare ye the way of the Lord, make his paths straight.

This is a blatant misquote of Isa 40:3.

I COULD GO ON BUT YOU GET THE POINT

The bottom line dear child of God...we have trusted in a document for our salvation and eternal life which is repudiates and is an adulteration of the only true revelation which truly reveals the way...the Bible Yeshua used...the Holy Tanakh. May all those who truly love the LORD and His Word....buy one and read it and study it. It is a sad reality to know that as a Christian that when you die you have never read the true Word of God because of all the additions and deletions made with theological purpose to both the Christian's Old and New Testaments.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHEN IS A BOOK NOT RECOGNIZED AS AN "INSPIRED" BOOK?

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God." Deuteronomy 4:2

Answer for yourself: If we were to ask a Christian layman: "Where did the Bible in your hands come from?," would he more than likely tell you "from God"? Yes.

Answer for yourself: If you were now to ask him: "How do you know it is from God? Would he most likely reply, "He inspired it to many people who then wrote it down and preserved it for us"? Most likely.

Answer for yourself: If we now ask: "Are all of these inspired people prophets?" would he most likely answer: "No, they include both prophets and other faultless 'saints', etc.."? Probably

Answer for yourself: If we were to ask: "Did these prophets and 'saints' signed their names to these documents?" would the typical Christian most likely respond: "No. But the Church knows who wrote them, and when they were written, and has irrefutable proof regarding this matter"? This would be a most typical response.

Answer for yourself: If we were to now ask: "would it be possible for any unscrupulous person who had access to the Bible in the past to modify it's books?" would the typical Christian reply: "Of course not! The church has told us that even the much older Old Testament was preserved with such diligent guardianship that they even counted and recorded every single word and every single letter in it. Thus, the church has justly reassured us that these words never have, and never could be, changed by mankind, even by scribal error or by accident"? Well, that is close to what I was told by my Christian teachers when growing up in Church.

Let us now ask a different question.

Answer for yourself: Are the 'New and Old Testaments' in your hands today the same "New and Old Testaments" available to the apostles of Yeshua till the present day?" The vast majority of Christians would answer "Of course! There has always been only one Bible!" Get ready for a shocker!

This is the general gist of any such conversation that is held between Christians who have studied the formation of the Bible and a Christian laymen who has not studied the formation of their Bibles, it's composition and preservation. However, if we were to ask our own Christian SCHOLARS the same set of questions we would be amazed to find a tremendous chasm in the responses supplied by the Christian lay-people as compared to their own Christian scholars.

Answer for yourself: Are you aware that if you were to go to a Western library and look up the history of the Bible as recorded by our own eminent Christian scholars throughout the ages, that you would find that they would tell you that the books of the "New Testament" in your possession today were not officially approved into

the New Testament "canon" of "inspired" books until many centuries after the departure of Yeshua? This is astounding!

Answer for yourself: Did you pay attention to the last statement?

Answer for yourself: Are you now asking yourself: "Where then are the books used by Yeshua and the original church that comprised their authoritative text"? You should be.

It is a staggering fact, I admit, but tens of generations of Christians literally lived and died after the departure of Yeshua never having known nor seen such a "New Testament" or "Bible" as the one in our possession today.

HOW DID IT HAPPEN WE LOST THE ORIGINAL BIBLE USED BY YESHUA AND THE EARLY CHURCH?

After the departure of Yeshua, the apostles and many other people began to write "gospels." Each one of these authors would travel to other lands and be followed by a number of people who would adopt this man's gospel as his "Bible." Now, even the unscrupulous began to write "gospels" and to claim they were from a given apostle or that they themselves were receiving divine inspiration. Many new and innovative teachings began now to be introduced into the religion of Yeshua. Enmity, hatred and war began to break out between these groups. Each person claimed that they alone held the "true" Gospel of Yeshua and no one else. Their beliefs now ran the gamut, from those who believed Yeshua to be a mortal messenger of God and nothing more, to those who claimed partial divinity for Yeshua, to those who claimed Yeshua to be a true god, but independent of God himself, to those who called for a "Trinity," to those who claimed that Mary too was a god, to those who believed in two gods, one good and the other evil. This is when the war of the gospels began.

Everyone now cursed and damned everyone else. Christian sects butchered one-another right and left. There were more great debates and councils than you could shake a stick at. However, none of these groups had sufficient might to totally dominate and silence the others for good. They needed an undefeatable ally, so they began to look to the Roman empire for support. The Roman empire was a pagan empire, however, it was the dominant "superpower" of the time. Anyone who could enlist it's aid would have an unconquerable ally at their side and would themselves be undefeatable. On the Roman side, Emperor Constantine was greatly troubled by the swelling ranks of his Christian subjects and the great division among their ranks which did not bode well for the continued stability of his empire.

Most of these fringe sects now began to fade into insignificance and the matter was now left between those who believed in the Unity of God and those who believed in a "Trinity." The Roman empire's support fluctuated between these two groups for a long time until the Trinitarian's finally gained the upper hand and all but wiped the Unitarians off the face of the earth. They selected and collected the "truly inspired" gospels into one volume which later became the "New Testament." They burned all other gospels. Many sweeping campaigns of "Inquisition" were launched. Everyone found possessing any of these "false" Gospels was put to death and his Gospel burned.

This state of affairs continued for many centuries and many people were convicted of heresy and burned to death at the stake for a great variety of reasons. Yet others had their land and property confiscated and were imprisoned. Physical torture was casually used in order to extract a confession of guilt which would then be used to justify a verdict of death by burning. Some of the methods used to extract a confession of guilt were the stretching of limbs on the rack, burning with live coals, and the strappado (a vertical rack). Denial of the charges without counterproof or refusal to confess resulted in the most severe punishments such as life imprisonment or execution and total confiscation of property. The number of those who fell victim to these inquisitions are far too numerous to list here. Examples of these people include the philosopher Giordano Bruno, Galileo, Joan of Arc, and the religious order of knights called the Templars among countless hundreds of thousands of others. If the Trinitarians did not have the power to burn these people at the stake during their

lifetime, then they would exhume their bodies after their death and burn them after their death (e.g. John Wycliffe). In the end, over twelve million people were put to death by the Church inquisitions (Apology for Muhammad and the Qur'an, John Davenport).

The inquisitions reached their height around the middle of the fifteenth century in a massive and vicious persecution campaign the major targets of which were the Marranos (converts from Judaism) and Moriscos (converts from Islam), many of whom were suspected of secretly adhering to their original faiths. When things began to quiet down a little, the victor's historians and philosophers wrote their history books explaining how they managed to overcome the wicked, to defeat the blasphemers, and to burn the devils, sorcerers, and witches at the stake. These are the books which have had the greatest influence on the Western history books we have in our hands today.

WHAT WOULD HAPPEN WHEN TRUTH WAS RE-DISCOVERED?

Whenever a scholar of Christianity would stumble upon the truth and begin to write about it his works would invariably be destroyed (e.g. Sir Isaac Newton, the 16th century Spaniard Michael Servetus, etc.). In all cases, it was recognized that there was no need to disprove the author's evidence or refute it, rather, it was sufficient to muzzle the opposition, burn their books, extract a confession from them under duress, and expel them from society or kill them.

Even the Popes themselves would sometimes recognize the falsehood of the "Trinity" and the fact that it was a later fabrication of mankind. One of these popes, Honorius, was officially cursed forty eight years after his death by the Synod which was held in Istanbul in 680 C.E.

Sometimes it is an individual's own silence which proves to be the most deafening proclamation. For the period of a century and more the only "Scriptures" used by the first Jewish followers of Yeshua were:

- The Hebrew Old Testament, "the Law and the Prophets and the Writings", supplemented by...
- Various Jewish apocrypha
- The Sibylline Oracles (150 BC to AD 180) and...
- The Greek Septuagint translations (commonly designated LXX) of the Hebrew Old Testament was used in Greek speaking areas of the world

These were the only "authorities" appealed to by the early "Church Fathers" when preaching their new faith. Nowhere do they quote the books which we know today as the "New Testament."

WHY DID THE EARLY GENTILE CHURCH ORIGINALLY NOT QUOTE FROM THE NEW TESTAMENT WRITINGS WE USE TODAY?

That is a good question. Naturally, if the "history" of the Trinitarian Church regarding their chosen Gospels and what are claimed to be the inspired writings of Yeshua's first Apostles were true, and these writings had indeed been accepted as authoritative at that time, then they would have been the most precious and potent documents of preaching for their doctrine. Undoubtedly, they would have spoken of nothing else, but would have quoted them and appealed to their authority at every turn as they have been doing through the centuries since. But, for some 150 years, little or nothing besides the Old Testament and these Oracles were known or quoted. As said by the great critic, Solomon Reinach,

"With the exception of Papias, who speaks of a narrative by Mark, and a collection of sayings of

Yeshua, no Christian writer of the first half of the second century (i.e., up to 150 C.E.) quotes the Gospels or their reputed authors." Orpheus, Reinach, p. 218

HOW AND WHEN WERE THE LETTERS MADE INTO THE NEW TESTAMENT WE CARRY TODAY?

But let us back up a little and study how and when the "inspired" books of the Bible were incorporated into the Christian "canon" of the Bible. Let us now have a very brief look at some of the details.

In the city of Nicea (modern: Iznik, Turkey), in the year 325 AD, a great conference of Christian theologians and religious scholars (Council of Nicea) was convened under the order of the Emperor Constantine to examine and define the status of these countless Christian Gospels. After a thorough investigation it was decided that the Epistle of Jude was genuine and believable. The rest of our current books of the Bible were declared doubtful. This was explicitly mentioned by Saint Jerome in the introduction to his book. St. Jerome, of course, was a Christian scholar and a great philosopher. He was born in 340 AD He translated the Bible into Latin. He was a famous bibliographer and wrote many books on the Bible. Before the year 325 C.E., it is known that the Gospel of Barnabas was accepted as canonical in the churches of Alexandria. It is known to have been circulated in the first two centuries after Christ from the writings of Irenaeus (130-200AD). After this council, four Gospels were selected out of a minimum of three hundred available and the rest, including the Gospel of Barnabas, were ordered utterly destroyed. All Gospels written in Hebrew were also ordered destroyed.

In the year 364 AD, another council was held in Laodicea for the same purpose. This conference of Christian scholars and theologians not only confirmed the decision of the council of Nicea regarding the authenticity of the Epistle of Jude but also declared that the following six books must also be added to the list of genuine and believable books: The Book of Esther, The Epistle Of James, The Second Epistle of Peter, The Second and Third Epistles of John, The Epistle of Paul to the Hebrews. This conference pronounced their decision to the public. The book of Revelations, however, remained out of the list of the acknowledged books in both the councils.

In 397 another great conference was held called the Council of Carthage. Augustine, the celebrated Christian scholar, was among the one hundred and twenty six learned participants. The members of this council confirmed the decisions of the two previous Councils and also added the following books to the list of the divine books: The Book of the Songs of Solomon, The Book of Tobit, The Book of Baruch, Ecclesiasticus, and The First and Second Books of Maccabees.

At the same time the members of this council decided that the book of Baruch was a part of the book of Jeremiah because Baruch was the deputy of Jeremiah. Therefore they did not include the name of this book separately in the list.

Three more conferences were held after this in Trullo, Florence and Trent (1545-63). The members of these meetings confirmed the decision of the Council of Carthage. The last two councils, however, wrote the name of the book of Baruch separately.

After these councils nearly all the books which had previously been doubtful among Christians were now included in the list of acknowledged books.

The status of these books remained unchanged until the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century. The Protestants repudiated the decisions of the councils and declared that there are only 66 truly "inspired" books of God, and not 73 as claimed by the Catholics. The following books were to be rejected: The Book of Baruch, The Book of Tobit, The Letter of Jude, The Songs of Solomon,

Ecclesiasticus, and The First and Second Books of Maccabees. They excluded these books from the list of acknowledged books.

Answer for yourself: Books in, books out....where is the inspiration and infallibility we have come to believe about the New Testament when our spiritual forefathers could not agree among themselves for over 1500 years?

The Protestants also rejected the decision of their forbears regarding some chapters of the book of Esther. This book consists of 16 chapters. They decided that the first nine chapters and three verses from chapter ten were to be rejected. They based their decision on the following six reasons:

- 1 These works were considered to be false even in the original Hebrew and Chaldaean languages which were no longer available.
- 2 The Jews did not acknowledge them as revealed books.
- 3 All the Christians have not acknowledged them as believable.
- 4 Jerome said that these books were not reliable and were insufficient to prove and support the doctrines of the faith.
- 5 Klaus has openly said that these books were recited but not in every place.
- 6 Eusebius specifically said in section 22 of his fourth book that these books have been tampered with, and changed. In particular the Second Book of Maccabees.

Answer for yourself: What is the tragic implication we must draw from such a scenario?

It now becomes apparent that books which had been lost in the original and which only existed in translation were erroneously acknowledged by thousands of theologians as divine revelation. This state of affairs leads a non-Christian reader to distrust the unanimous decisions of Christian scholars of both the Catholic and the Protestant persuasions. The followers of Catholic faith still believe in these books in blind pursuance of their forebears.

It is a prerequisite of believing in a certain book as divinely revealed that it is proved through infallible arguments that the book in question was revealed through a prophet and that it has been conveyed to us precisely in the same order without any change through an uninterrupted chain of narrators. It is not at all sufficient to attribute a book to a certain prophet on the basis of suppositions and conjectures. Unsupported assertions made by one or a few sects of people should not be, and cannot be, accepted in this connection.

We have already seen how Catholic and Protestant scholars differ on the question of the authenticity of some of these books. There are yet more books of the Bible which have been rejected by Christians. They include the Book of Revelation, the Book of Genesis, the Book of Ascension, the Book of Mysteries, the Book of Testament and the Book of Confession which are all ascribed to the Prophet Moses. Similarly a fourth Book of Ezra is claimed to be from the Prophet Ezra and a book concerning Isaiah's ascension and revelation are ascribed to him. In addition to the known book of Jeremiah, there is another book attributed to him. There are numerous sayings which are claimed to be from the Prophet Habakkuk. There are many songs which are said to be from the Prophet Solomon. There are more than 70 books, other than the present ones, of the new Testament, which are ascribed to Yeshua, Mary, the apostles, and their disciples. In this day and age, some Christian scholars are even making the case for the authenticity of the Gospel of Thomas as the "fifth" Gospel (see "The Five Gospels," written over six years by 24 Christian scholars from some of the USA and Canada's most prestigious universities)

The Christians of this age have claimed that these books are false and forgeries. The Greek Church, Catholic church and the Protestant Church are unanimous on this point. Similarly the Greek Church claims that the third book of Ezra is a part of the Old Testament and believes it to have been written by the Prophet Ezra while the Protestant and Catholic Churches have declared it false and fabricated.

Groliers encyclopedia says under the heading "New Testament, canon":

"The process by which the canon of the New Testament was formed began in the 2d century, probably with a collection of ten letters of Paul. Toward the end of that century, Irenaeus argued for the unique authority of the portion of the Canon called the Gospels. Acceptance of the other books came gradually. The church in Egypt used more than the present 27 books, and the Syriac-speaking churches fewer. The question of an official canon became urgent during the 4th century. It was mainly through the influence of Athanasius, bishop of Alexandria, and because Jerome included the 27 books in his Latin version of the Bible called the Vulgate, that the present canon came to be accepted.."

Notice how the writings of Paul were the first to be accepted by the Trinitarian church. All other gospels were then either accepted or destroyed based upon their conformance to the teachings of Paul

As mentioned previously, Lobegott Friedrich Konstantin Von Tischendorf was one of the most eminent conservative Biblical scholars of the nineteenth century. One of his greatest lifelong achievements was his discovery of one of the oldest known Biblical manuscripts known to mankind, the "Codex Sinaiticus," with the monks of Saint Catherine's Monastery in Mount Sinai. In this oldest known copy of the Bible known to humanity we find contained two gospels which would later be discarded by a more enlightened generation. They are "The Epistle of Barnabas" (not to be confused with the Gospel of Barnabas), and "The Shepherd of Hermas." Today, of course, neither of these two books is to be found in our modern Bibles. Many later "insertions" of the church were exposed through the study of this manuscript. However, following in the tradition of true conservative Christian scholars before him, Tischendorf managed to apply 12,000 "corrections" to this manuscript's 110,000 lines before he was through "transcribing" it (see "secrets of Mount Sinai", James Bentley, Doubleday, NY, 1986, p. 95)

I can't leave this article without a summary statement about the Apostle Paul. Let it be understood that "St. Paul" all but totally obliterated the religion of Yeshua based upon the authority of his alleged "visions". His teachings were based more upon his personal philosophy and beliefs than any attempt to cite words or actions of Yeshua himself (e.g. Galatians 2). His followers slaughtered all Christians who would not forsake the teachings of the apostles for his teachings and how he was later made the "majority author" of the Bible and countless authentic gospels were burned and labeled apocrypha by his followers. Remember, "St. Paul" is claimed to be the author of Romans, 1 and 2 Corinthians, Galatians, Ephesians, Phillipians, Colossians, 1 and 2 Thessalonians, 1 and 2 Timothy, Titus, Philemon, and Hebrews.

"All the evidence indicates that the words of Yeshua were authoritative in the Church from the first, and this makes it the more remarkable that such scanty attention is paid to the words or works of Yeshua in the earliest Christian writings, Paul's letters, the later Epistles, Hebrews, Revelation, and even Acts have little to report about them... Papias (ca. AD 130), the first person to actually name a written gospel, illustrates the point. Even though he defends Mark's gospel (Euseb. Hist. III.xxxix.15-16), and had himself appended a collection of Yeshua traditions to his 'Interpretation of the Oracles of the Lord' (Euseb. Hist. III.xxxix.2-3), his own clear preference was for the oral tradition concerning Yeshua, and the glimpses that Eusebius provides of Papias' Yeshua tradition give no hint of his dependence on Mark. Neither do the more frequent citations of Yeshua in the APOSTOLIC FATHERS, largely 'synoptic' in character show much dependence on our written gospels"

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible, Supplementary Volume, p. 137

The Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible contains much more revealing information in this regard, far too much to reproduce here. The reader is strongly encouraged to locate a copy in their local library and read the details.

The popularly accepted dates for the authorship of the current books of the Bible are approximately as follows:

Approx. AD Event / Document

- 30 Crucifixion (Ascension) of Yeshua
- 50 First Epistle of Paul
- 62 Last Epistle of Paul
- 65-70 Mark's Gospel
- 70 Epistle to Hebrews
- 80 Luke's Gospel
- 85-90 Matthew's Gospel
- 90 Acts
- 90-100 John's Gospel and First Epistle
- 95-100 Revelation
- 100 I & II Timothy and Titus

Uncertainty about James I & II, Peter, John and Jude does not allow historians to estimate their origin dates. (See "The Early Church And The New Testament," Irene Allen, 1953). **We begin to see the degree to which our current religion of "Christianity" is based more on the teachings and writings of Paul than anything else.** The Gospels which are popularly believed to have been written first were in actuality written long after the writings of Paul. Now Christian scholars are even beginning to uncover extensive evidence that these Gospels were not even written by their claimed authors. **The more Christian scholars study the Bible, the more it becomes painfully apparent that what is popularly referred to today as "Christianity" should more appropriately be named "Paulanity."**

Even when a book is claimed to be truly "inspired" we still find that the Church cannot say with 100% assuredness who wrote this "inspired" book. As mentioned there, the authors of the RSV Bible by Collins say that the author of "Kings" is "Unknown," the book of Isaiah is "Mainly credited to Isaiah. Parts may have been written by others." Ecclesiastics: "Author. Doubtful, but commonly assigned to Solomon." Ruth: "Author. Not definitely known, perhaps Samuel." and on and on.

Answer for yourself: Is this how a truly unbiased mind defines "inspired by God"? You be the judge.



RELIGIOUS FACTS OR FICTION...WHAT DO YOU PREFER?

"Craig, you can't present all the facts to the average person; it would destroy their faith!"

I have heard this statement from so many ministers, theologians, and even scholars that I have literally lost count. I know that something is drastically wrong with our religious system. I know it, and I know that many of you know it as well because in almost all of my conversations this topic continually emerges in one way or another. If I could use one word to summarize observations made about the American religious system, it would be that it is SICK.

Upon much contemplation I have come to believe that the initial step in solving the problem is to consider the cause of it. For over the past fifteen years I have pursued a course of independent study in which I examined my religious doctrines, not only the ones I believe but also those I proclaimed from the pulpit. Almost as soon as I embarked on this journey, I discovered that I had been the victim of a cover-up that made Watergate look like child's play.

Having the benefit of training in Greek and Hebrew studies of the Bible, I learned facts that challenged the very foundation of my belief system. During the years I pastored at a large non-denominational church in Dallas, I had occasion to often inform other teachers and pastors of my discoveries. In almost every case they either told me I was wrong and I should immediately stop my research, or even more shocking to me, said they were already aware of the information and simply chose not to make it public. Many told me, "Craig, you can't present all the facts to the average Christian; it would destroy their faith!" I disagree!

I continued to question my beliefs since what I had learned in Seminary, as well as my own further studies, revealed facts that I could no longer overlook or avoid. I became aware of some universal facts that could withstand examination by individuals within my faith and, more importantly, individuals outside my faith. It soon became clear to me that some of my doctrines had to be set-aside when confronted with new facts that proved them in error, or else I would have to continue to accept as sacred "old-truths" which were now revealed to be outright falsehoods.

Here comes the hard part. For those of you who are pastors, teachers, evangelists, deacons, and elders, if you decide to embark on this journey for truth, you may find yourself in a major crisis. Some of you may be asked to resign, while others may be openly slandered. If you are an ordained minister, you may lose your papers, pay check and or retirement. However, the decision you will make is very simple: "Are you going to be honest with those who trust in you, or are you going to be an active participant in one of the greatest cover-ups in history?" To all others I ask:

"Are you going to be honest with yourself and your God?"

I came to the decision that I had to present the facts to you even if it meant causing you to question your faith! Just take a look at some evidence.

Answer for yourself: Did you know that the Bible gets the unique credit from being the motivating force behinds the actions of some of the most significant people in history-from Yeshua to Hitler, Mother Teresa to Jim Jones, Hillel to Falwell?

There have been days that I have wondered if I were the only person confounded by the reality of this fact.

Answer for yourself: How can so many contradicting doctrines and philosophies in the over 1500 denominations in Christianity today all be based on the one common source?

FACT OR FICTION AFFECTS YOUR VIEWS ON SALVATION

One of the earliest conflicts I faced along the journey was concerned with the doctrine of salvation. Being from a major denominational background, I assumed that the doctrine of "once saved, always saved" was without question. I was taught that this doctrine was based on scriptures such as John 6:37,

"All that the Father giveth me shall come to me; and him that commeth to me I will in no wise cast him out."

Everything was "OK" until I read Romans 11:21-22,

"For if God spared not the natural branches, take heed lest he also spare not thee. Behold therefore the goodness and severity; but toward thee, his goodness, if thou continue in his goodness; otherwise thou also shalt be cut off."

I quickly had a real problem on my hands. On the one hand, my religious training, which was based on the Bible, taught me I could never be cut off, but the Bible was also telling me that I could. A question now confronted me that I had never considered before, "Could I lose my salvation?"

Seeking an answer to this questions led me directly to my next conflict which was the question of salvation: Grace or Works. The way I understood my denominational teachings was that after being saved it really didn't matter how I lived or what I did because I was still going to heaven when I died. This was a very convenient doctrine because it allowed me to do anything I wanted to do while I was on earth, good or bad, and still get my mansion in heaven. My understanding was that this doctrine was based on Romans 10:9-10, "That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation."

Such confession was accomplished by responding to the invitation at the close of the service and that once I had been down the aisle my place in heaven was assured. This is how I understood grace. This belief was reinforced through many sermons based on verses such as Romans 11:6, "And if by grace, then is it no more of works: otherwise grace is no more grace. But if it be of works, then is it no more grace; otherwise work is no more work." When this verse is coupled with Romans 10:9-10, there seems to be an air-tight doctrine proclaiming that actions have nothing to do with eternal life.

Thank goodness I read the Bible for myself and not just my Sunday School Quarterly because I read Revelation 20:11-13, "And I saw a great white throne, and him that sat on it, from whose face the earth and the heaven fled away; and there was found no place for them. And I saw the dead, small and great, stand before God; and the books were opened; and another book was opened, which is the book of life: and the dead were judged out of those things which were written in the books, according to their works. And the sea gave up the dead which were in it; and death and hell delivered up the dead which were in them; and they were judged every man according to their works. And death and hell were cast into the lake of fire. This is the second death. And whosoever was not found written in the book of life was cast into the lake of fire." As you may guess, I had

another major crisis on my hands.

My church doctrine was telling me that I was saved by grace and works were not important; but, I kept studying my Bible, and it says that I was saved by grace but will be judged by my works! To the best of my reasoning ability, I concluded that anyone following my denomination's doctrine could live a lifetime believing they were saved, while possibly ending up in the lake of fire on Judgment Day.

Torn by this dilemma, I continued my studies and came to understand by returning to the original languages and culture of the people of the Bible, that salvation must be understood in relationship to righteousness, which consists of both grace and works.

WHOSE BIBLE IS THE REAL BIBLE?

In coming to terms with understanding Biblical salvation, I needed only to consult my Bible.

Answer for yourself: But, why was my Bible the real Bible when others carried different Bibles from mine? My American Jewish friend's Bible is what we call the Old Testament, while to my Catholic friends the Bible consist of the Old Testament, New Testament and Apocrypha. My Bible contains more than the Jewish Bible and less than the Catholic Bible. To make matters worse, I soon discovered that none of these Bibles was "the Bible" but only a translation.

I learned that all translations supposedly came from the "original scriptures." The answer was simple, all I needed to do was obtain a copy of the original scriptures to see which Bible was the right one. I was then told, "We do not have any original scriptures, although we do have some ancient copies of them." Hoping that a quick glance at them would solve this problem only led me to another major problem. One of the most ancient copies of original scriptures included "The First and Second Epistles of Clement to the Corinthians," while another included "The Shepherd of Hermas" and "The Epistle of Barnabas," none of which is included in the Jewish, Catholic or my Bible. Why?

Other questions flooded my mind.

Answer for yourself: Why doesn't the Jewish Bible include the New Testament and or the Apocrypha?

Answer for yourself: Why doesn't my Bible contain the Apocrypha?

Answer for yourself: Why doesn't the Catholic Bible contain the Epistles of Clement and Barnabas or the Shepherd of Hermas?

These questions led to a more basic question:

Answer for yourself: Who made the decision as to which books should be included in the Bible and which should be excluded?

At first I didn't really understand the magnitude of this question; but, as time passed, I began to face the reality that certain men (Gentiles belonging to the Church of Rome-Roman - Catholics) decided which writings were to be considered sacred and which were to be considered non-sacred..and to make matters worse these men were shown to be blatant anti-semites and Jesus was a Jew. More problems.

What this means is that someone who was anti-Semitic shaped the content of what many call "The Word of God."...does that sound right to you?

IF ANY SHALL ADD OR TAKE AWAY FROM THE WORDS OF THIS BOOK.....(THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES)....

Having opened a can of worms with the above questions, I quickly decided to use multiple translations in my Bible study. Problems surfaced again. In reading John 5 in the New International Version, I discovered that the verses were numbered, 1,2,3,5, 6, etc.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that verse 4 was missing?

Answer for yourself: Do you have several different versions around the house?

If you do, stop and check it out (by the way this isn't the only instance). When I was investigating why verse 4 was missing, I soon made another major discovery. There are literally thousands of manuscripts and fragments of New Testament writings. When you line them up and compare their words, they are not always the same. Sometimes there are additional words, changes in word order, different endings and prefixes on the Greek words, and entire verses added or omitted. Many times verses from the Jewish Scriptures are not merely "mistranslated" but purposefully altered to bring completely new meanings to the Christian's Bibles that were not in the earliest Jewish texts from which the Christian's Bible was supposed to come. I could continue with many other examples of textual variations (see two other websites where we tackle these problems: <http://returningtofaithofyeshua.freesevers.com> & <http://paulproblem.faithweb.com>) but I want to point out the most alarming discovery of my pilgrimage. Even after being able to determine which words were most likely to be the original words I still was unable to understand their original meaning because I applied my American meanings to ancient Jewish words. It is an indisputable fact that the meaning of words is determined by their author's culture and system of thought. Therefore, in order for me to understand the meaning of words of the Old or New Testament, I had to identify and learn the culture of the writers. This is not as hard as it sounds, for all the writers of the New Testament, as well as the Old Testament, were Jews. The answer was simple, one only has to understand the Hebrew culture and system of thought before he can understand correctly the author's message as presented in any book of the Bible. This simple fact seems to be almost unknown to the average person and most Christian Bible translators, for many Bible translators apply American meaning to Hebrew words without considering the differences between the two systems of thought. The fact of the matter is that they were not translating the Bible, but rather completely reinterpreting it to reflect evangelical theology.

HEBREW...GREEK...OR ENGLISH?

The earliest Christian church had no Gentile members. Therefore, the members of that church had no need to study Hebrew culture and thought since they were Hebrews. Before the death of the Apostle John, however, new cultures and systems of thought invaded the church as Greek-speaking Gentiles became its leaders and interpreters. They were very familiar with the Greek manuscripts or both the Old and New Testaments but not familiar with the Hebrew culture or system of thought from which the Scriptures originated. It was inevitable that conflicts concerning the interpretation of Scriptures would arise in the church between its Gentile and Jewish members. In order to solve these conflicts, the elders used their Gentile cultures and systems of thought to give new meanings to the Jewish Scriptures.

This process that originated by the Gentile leaders of the early church had three significant consequences. First, the original message of each author became unknown to the church; second, Christian Gentiles came to regard the Jews as their enemies; and third, the original purpose of the church as established by Yeshua was lost. These consequences were based on a single, fundamental difference between Hebrew and Gentile (Greek) thought--namely, that certain words (such as love,

righteousness, forgiveness, etc.) to the Hebrew mind signified concrete actions, but to the Greek mind these same words signified abstractions. In other words, statements such as , "A new commandment I give unto you that you love one another as I have loved you," were understood in different ways by the Gentile Christians. The Christian Gentiles believed they had fulfilled this commandment simply through abstract or emotional feelings, whereas Christian Jews believed that this commandment was fulfilled only when they put their feelings into actions.

Let me give you a good example how these two Christian groups (Jew and Gentile) would have reacted to the same situation. Suppose a member of the church did not have enough food to feed his family. The Christian Gentile could go to that person, knowing the situation, pray for them, have a good feeling about the situation, and leave. The Christian Gentile would believe that he had fulfilled the new commandment. If the Christian Jew encountered the same family, he would obtain food for them and know that he had fulfilled the commandment. Only in this way could he say that he loved them.

Having spent much time thinking about the differences between the Jewish and Gentile cultures and systems of thought, it didn't take long to realize that the **Gentile mindset was responsible for the illness of the church.** I suppose that this illness can be reflected in no greater capacity as in the perversion of the tithe as preached in Gentile Christian churches today, as God's tithe goes toward building bigger and fancier buildings instead of building up people by meeting their needs. This is a horrible sin which can be blamed upon ignorance of the Jewish Scriptures and greed.

The conclusion that Yeshua will ultimately judge mankind on the basis of their actions was reinforced by my study of Matthew 25, which describes the final judgment. This same sentiment seems to be reflected in the following quotation from Mother Teresa in summing up Yeshua's position on the matter: "At the end of life we will not be judged by how many diplomas we have received, how much money we have made, how many great things we have done. **We will be judged by 'I was hungry and you gave me to eat, I was naked and you clothed me, I was homeless and you took me in.'** Hungry not only for bread, but for love. Naked not only for clothing, but naked of human dignity and respect. Homeless not only for want of a room of bricks, but homeless because of rejection. This is Christ in distressing disguise."

THE BOTTOM LINE AND THE ULTIMATE QUESTION

Looking back, my entire journey was, in reality, an attempt to answer one question: **"As a person who believes in God, what am I supposed to do with my life?"** I had been taught the only place to look for such an answer was the Bible. However, in retrospect, I learned that my perception of the Bible proved to be the origin of many of my problems because my "teachers" taught conflicting doctrines, each of which was supposedly based on the Bible. My dilemmas, which are undoubtedly shared by many, sprang from the teaching that every word of the Bible is to be taken literally. In reality, however, what was called a literal meaning turned out to be my preacher's theology.

TRUTH IN RELIGIOUS....DO YOU REALLY WANT IT?

Most leaders in the religious world are very much aware of the various problems with their doctrines. They are usually aware of those "other scriptures" that disagree with their published teachings. **But the average man or woman on the street is never presented with this information. You are not allowed to see all of the information so that you can make your own intelligent decisions.**

It is my goal as Pastor and teacher of Bet Emet Ministries to provide you with that factual information, not just conclusions which represent one side of the issue. From the biblical point of view **to withhold information is a form of fraud or theft.** To steal a man's mind is the greatest form of theft.

As stated earlier, I firmly believe that you can handle factual information and you can make solid decisions once

you are presented with all the facts. I am committed to a course that consists of gathering factual information from all sources and getting that information into your hands, even if it disproves what I have thought to be truth previously.

EXPOSING THE ERRORS THAT PREVAIL

Two of the greatest errors that have been allowed to prevail and dominate our religious world are: "We will never be able to agree" and " Everyone must interpret the Bible for himself." We would never apply this principle in our businesses, marriages, etc. and expect to achieve any degree of success.

We must make the facts public and expose the "cover-up." We must jointly and openly test all doctrines and tell the results to all people. Let's not be afraid to ask questions and seek facts about the Bible. Let us begin with these questions:

- **Do you know the history of your Bible?**
- **Are all Bibles the same?**
- **What role does your Bible play in your life?**
- **Should a Christians use the same Bible as Yeshua and is he aware that he does not?**
- **Do you believe your Bible is the inerrant and infallible "Word of God?" but have you studied enough to see these "purposeful additions, deletions, corruptions" of what I speak?**
- **What role should a Bible play in the lives of a Christian community?**
- **What are the various reading of the manuscripts and what relevance do they hold for me?**
- **Who decided which books would be included or excluded from the Bible I carry and if I cannot accept their "religious belief system" -Catholic- how can I accept "their Bible"?**
- **What difference does it make when the author's culture, way of thinking, and existing religious belief system, are factors in the translation?**
- **Does the Bible really support the numerous conflicting doctrines within the churches today?**
- **Has there always been a Bible?**
- **Do you want your religious beliefs to be based on facts you learn or on an imposed doctrinal system that you accepted only by faith without any personal study and verification of it's credibility?**

We must face reality! Truth is not to be feared but sought!



WHAT SHOULD WE DO WITH AN UNRELIABLE NEW TESTAMENT?

Recently we encountered a rather common reaction by some connected to this ministry when presented with certain facts concerning the New Testament that challenged its "inerrancy" and "infallibility." When people are exposed to such information after "believing otherwise since childhood" they often are shaken and make decisions which are less than wise in an over-reaction to what they have learned. Conservatism is always the best course to take, but when confronted with facts that challenge one's belief system and expose much of it as error, these newly "frustrated skeptics" usually voice repeatedly and make sweeping statements to the fact that since the New Testament (NT) has been shown to contain numerous errors and inaccurate accounts of both historical facts that the New Testament should not be used "at all." In other words, they believe since it can be shown to much less than inerrant and infallible; it has no value any longer. Such I believe is not the right course to take even when confronted with many errors, additions, and deletions concerning the religion of Judaism (not to mention the inclusion of multiple accounts of paganism mixed in with Judaism and passed off as "normative" Christianity). Let me say again that we at Bet Emet believe that the New Testament CANNOT be ignored in its entirety due to a "biased agenda" on the part of the early Church in their attempt to replace the religion of Yeshua with one of their own making (which is our legacy today).

What are we to do with such charges, but more than that, with the others who lack adequate understanding, knowledge, and stability in this area who are swayed by other's comments and totally desire to do away completely with the New Testament instead of studying to correctly interpret it? How reliable is the New Testament? What should be the role played by the New Testament in the life of an "informed believer" who has been awakened to the hidden truths within the New Testament which only consistent scholarship will reveal? Instead of letting "the knowledge of the truth set them free," too often these new initiates to conflicting truths that expose much of the New Testament as fable respond in panic and "lose their faith" instead of interpreting such experience as God removing the error from their life in order to draw them closer to Him and allowing them, maybe for the first time in their lives, to worship Him in Spirit and in TRUTH. With this as the goal I wish in this article to reveal to the average Christians the role of the New Testament for his life after he has come to such knowledge of the unreliability of the New Testament and is convinced of this fact from multiple attestations from facts, language, and history.

THE FALLACY OF "ALL OR NOTHING" MENTALITY

The skeptic who wishes to dismiss the entire NT as a "pious fraud" misunderstands the purpose and historical origins of the NT texts. Although NT contradictions exist concerning both Yeshua and Paul (changes regarding both what they originally believed and taught), it does not discredit the historical basis of the NT record of the New Testament event which is only the "record" of the oral tradition concerning the events recorded. However, not all is as simple as that, for we know from narrative criticism that many NT events were invented to tell a story about Yeshua (in particular to pit him against his religion and his religion against him; thus creating the need for a new religion, as well as mixing within Judaism elements of paganism and mystery religions). Please request newsletter #2 of the series "Jewish Origins Of

Christianity" where beyond a doubt I prove to you by factual as well as historical analysis that events recorded in the New Testament COULD NEVER HAVE HAPPENED because they involve "issues" where are easily provable as inaccurate when considering the religion of Judaism. We can be certain of this because of inaccuracies in dates, historical events, and things said about Judaism which are entirely incorrect thus revealing a non-Jewish writer who got his facts incorrect (which no Jewish child would, let alone record as fact things which are not). But you see, because the average Christian knows little or nothings about Judaism, we read the accounts of the New Testament as if they are recorded FACTUALLY, when only a slight understanding of Judaism (the religion of Yeshua) will quickly show you that what is recorded as occurring to Yeshua could not have since it would require conditions to exist which never would or could. Read that newsletter and see for yourself.

Having understood the problem as stated above, when we are able to do so we should give the benefit of the doubt to those passages that seem historically or contextually probable within the New Testament as the New Testament is the chronicle of evens first possessed as "oral traditions" which were eventually written and recorded.

The problem seems to lie with an irrational "all or nothing" approach to the NT texts. When the debate over "all or nothing acceptance of the New Testament" is objectively viewed as representing only the extreme views of both sides of the ideological spectrum the result is often little more than a glimpse at the insecurity of the believer or the stubborn pride of the skeptic when encountering truths which challenge his belief system. What we need in modern Biblical scholarship and criticism is less dogmatism from both extremes and more understanding of current conservative mainstream biblical scholarship.

Josh McDowell [1976] feels that any biblical interpretation which deviates from Fundamentalist orthodoxy (and who is to determine that?) will result in a "slippery-slope" ending in agnosticism. I believe he is severely in error, for to agree with his stance means you uphold your church tradition over conflicting Biblical facts or truths which often correct your church. Such action discredits the Bible and God Himself. If you think of it, if your experience is to be the barometer of your "truth" you literally make God a liar when His Word contradicts your experience.

At the other extreme are a handful of dogmatic skeptics who, in their enthusiastic fantasy to bring the whole Bible crashing down around us, proceed to engage in poor exegesis and confused interpretation. Many of these "enlightened" skeptics would themselves benefit from "trips to the library" where they can spend years of investigative research to help them arrive at truths not quickly seen or understood.

Despite this charged atmosphere, we can still look critically at the NT and analyze those parts of it which are based in historical fact, and contrast them to those passages which seem contextually or historically improbable. Biblical scholars have many tools at their disposal to analyze the NT texts and to arrive at working hypotheses and conclusions. What is required to use these tools is an open mind and attention to detail; preconceived conclusions will only get in the way and hamper your search for truth. Simply said if Yeshua is portrayed differently in a passage from that of known fact or history, then that passage must be treated with greater suspicion.

FOR EXAMPLE...

For example, some passages portray Yeshua in ideological conflict with Pharisaic bystanders (Mt. 23:23-25). But many of Yeshua's own actions and teachings are uniquely Pharisaic in origin: "The Sabbath was made for man, not man for the Sabbath".

Many scholars believe that Yeshua was a Pharisee himself. Therefore those passages which attempt to portray Pharisees fervently disagreeing with Yeshua are suspicious due to this problem of context and must be analyzed further in light of what Judaism both believed and taught. The answer to this problem of context may be a simple one, because with little reading and research, you can easily see that many times when Yeshua is

challenged by Pharisees over the washing of hand, healing on the Sabbath, or eating on the Sabbath, or doing "work" on the Sabbath, enlightened research reveals that Judaism and the Pharisees NEVER, NEVER, NEVER held such positions that would lead to "supposed" conflicts with Yeshua. NEVER! These supposedly instances of conflict between Yeshua and the leaders of his religion are easily provable to be "inventions" of the Gentile church which would later try to lay the groundwork for having Yeshua being forced to reject his faith, thus paying the way for the creation of a new religion and Gentile faith (contemporary Christianity) to replace a Jewish faith which disowned Yeshua. It never happened. Perhaps the writer couldn't remember who it was that argued with Yeshua and so inserted the Pharisees into that portion of the text out of convenience instead of "Sadducees" which inquiry would suggest. This happens a lot in the New Testament. One quick example...Paul was carrying letters to arrest those of this new faith in Damascus (no less) as recorded in Acts as he persecuted the "elect.". One problem, a Pharisee NEVER had such a right or power of arrest, but only those working in league with the Chief Priest or Sadducees. So which was Paul....a Pharisee or Sadducees, for one thing is certain, Gamileal tells the Sadducees and Chief Priest to quit beating Peter and John and to let them alone.....this is the stance of Phariseeism toward this Messianic Movement within Judaism. It was Paul who sided with and worked in league with the Sadducees because no Pharisee could or would understanding the extreme conflict between the two camps. So who is writing that Paul had always been a Pharisee... "a Pharisee of Pharisees?

ANOTHER EXAMPLE

An example of "narrative" that seems to conflict with fact and history is the story of Yeshua' arrest and trial. Pilate is introduced as a confused, yet sympathetic peace-maker in the focal crowd-scene prior to the demand for the release of Yeshua Barabbas. (Mk. 15; Lk. 23; Jn. 18) The narrative seems entirely made up for several reasons: "Barabbas" is Aramaic for "Son of God," a title thought to be Yeshua Christ's. Also, there was NEVER a custom of releasing prisoners on Passover or any Jewish holiday. Pilate's persona seems absurdly out of place from the bloodthirsty monster that Philo wrote emperor Augustus about. Crucifixion was a Roman punishment reserved for sedition but Yeshua seems to have been accused of blasphemy in the Synoptics (a purely Jewish religious offense). Rome didn't care if Yeshua had blasphemed God. They did it all the time themselves. There are reasonable explanations for this narrative appearing as it does, primarily that many early Christians were afraid to portray Rome as an antagonist to their movement for fear of persecution. By shifting the blame for Yeshua' death to the Jews (an already defeated people from the Jewish Revolt of 70 CE) Christian apologists could convince their pagan neighbors that they held no grudge against them. This narrative however began a long tradition of anti-Semitism that flourishes in the Gospel of John as the writer "lumps and dumps" all Jews as guilty of unbelief by calling them collectively as "the Jews." As the church gains secular power after Constantine's conversion (312 CE) Augustine writes that Jews are allowed to live in the Empire, but only in ghettos and with reduced rights as citizens. (City of God 18.46) After Yeshua was "declared to be God" by the Chalcedonian Definition (451 CE) Jews were accused of deicide (God-killers) and were persecuted until many resettled in Spain and in Moorish lands in North Africa.

Or the answer may be more involved in that the entire event never really occurred at all (for example Yeshua nullifying the Levitical Laws concerning clean and unclean foods in Mark 7 for to do so would have amounted to sin for him to violate the Law. If Yeshua only "says" what he hears the Father say, then how is it possible for him to say something different than the Torah which commands certain foods to be unclean and unfit for consumption. Creative fiction was a frequent tool of the Gentile church as they would put words in the mouth of the Pharisees and Yeshua as well. With some informed study these accounts in the New Testament which are at first understood to say one thing, will upon such study, say something quite different from what we read and the account in question quickly becomes a "non-issue." Such account were usually created to separate Yeshua from his faith, they necessitating the creation of a replacement religion. It is in this gray area that biblical scholars must operate. Never is there a time when a scholar decides to "throw out" the entire NT because of such contextual problems. For only by accurate interpretation and examination of the NT will we come to understand the dynamics involved that caused the Gentiles to follow "another Gospel" when warned not too, and only through "informed" study of the New Testament can we see how the Gentile fit into Israel before the artificial and total separation of "Jewish

Christianity" from "Biblical Judaism" in the fourth century.

Also, there is never a time when a scholar takes the entire NT "prima facie". It is incorrect to argue that the entire NT is "divinely-inspired" or historically valid in every detail. Yet it is just this position that the average church member seems to believe. There are hundred and hundreds of errors and contradictions in the New Testament alone which the casual reader often overlooks. Send for my list of Biblical Contradictions to quickly understand that there is no such thing as "inerrancy" and "infallibility" to the Bibles we carry today. In their zeal to refute such attacks on the presumed "infallibility and inerrancy" of the Bible, average "unknowledgeable" Christians defend ferociously this biased fallacy of inerrancy. In the face of conflicting facts only heard but never studied for themselves they contend that the NT is completely reliable and unbiased in its entirety. As I have just pointed out, when the NT is seen in the proper context this pendulum swing is unwarranted and just as awkward as the radical skeptic's bias charge.

EVOLUTION OF THE JESUS TRADITION

When we do critique the NT texts further we find that there were many "layers" of tradition and story piled atop the historical Yeshua. This dynamic process obscures the historical Yeshua from the later Christology that most contemporary Christians advocate which was created in the fourth century, but had no such previous foundation.

Today Christians and Jews disagree as to who this obscured historical Yeshua really was, but they do agree that the post-Easter Christ which is taught today is far different from the real wandering rabbi and Jewish peasant of first-century Palestine. That this very metamorphosis of Yeshua took place is the subject of this work and this ministry. I shall attempt to show that both the NT texts and the resultant portrayal of Yeshua have changed radically since the early first century when Yeshua lived. Not only has the Christian Church believed in "another Gospel," but they put their faith and trust in "another Yeshua" other than the historical Yeshua who actually lived. Having said that let me ask you this: "Don't you want the facts concerning the "real Yeshua" and don't you desire to have your faith placed in the truth concerning this Jewish Rabbi named Yeshua? If you do then please read on.

WHY THE ALL OR NOTHING MENTALITY IS WRONG

There are generally seven arguments for the integrity and veracity of the NT in general and the four canonical gospels in particular:

The apostles are never legendized and are portrayed as normal, human beings complete with the failures that such humanity entails. The apostles stood the most to gain from exaggerating their own exploits, but since they did not aggrandize themselves this argues against bias on their part. The texts themselves look and feel like narrative history, not a work of fiction. There is only one problem, the Bible we carry today is not the collection of documents used by Yeshua's church in the first century, but consist of Paul's writings along with Gentile renditions called "Gospels" created at the turn of the century. The "texts" considered Scripture by the early Yeshua Church can be found today, however, mainline Christianity have inherited a "Catholic Bible" and seem little interested in knowing differently. It never ceases to amaze me that since we use a "Catholic Bible," then why do we refuse to attend the Catholic Church? Lastly, by the way, those who determined which writings were to be in the "New Testament" prayed to Mary, prayed to the dead, believed in purgatory, gave money (indulgences) to buy out of punishment loved ones who previously perished, believed the wine and bread of the Eucharist (Lord's Supper) actually became the ACTUAL flesh and blood of Yeshua, etc. Need I go on? Does it not bother you that you cannot accept anything of which I just recorded, but yet we trust "their spirituality" in selecting a groups of writings that completely replaced the authority of Yeshua's Bible...the Torah and Tanakh?

- The early Jewish Church acted consistently in an anti-bias fashion, purging heretical texts from its own canon. This preserved the integrity of the texts as we have them today because they "knew the difference" between "reliable and unreliable reports" and "opted for the truth."

- The miracles that Yeshua performed were unique in their telling and were not told with a flair that would indicate exaggeration or fabrication.
- Each gospel was written without the influence of the other writers in different parts of the known world. As such, they constitute "five to eight independent witnesses" to the miracle accounts which indicates that the miracles ring true. Although the gospels share "some data" they have a very different "development path" using different literary styles and oral traditions as their foundation. Since each gospel seems to derive from a different source (the Synoptic problem) and yet tell the same story, we have excellent evidence for an unbiased and historically truthful account of Yeshua' ministry.
- Even where the gospels do share a like source, (Mark was used by both Matthew and Luke, "there is no tendency to embellish the narratives. The writers seem to function as responsible scribes, in an area in which it would be easy/natural to embellish or fabricate." Given that there were many places where the authors could have placed "innocent" statements to embellish Yeshua and they did not, we can rely on the gospel narratives as historically valid accounts.
- Another reason for not throwing out the entire New Testament because of inaccuracies and fabrications is the argument that says that the time period was too short between Yeshua' own ministry and the appearance of these documents to indicate wholesale fabrication in the manner so typical of the Hellenistic "divine man" gods of the period. Because the Yeshua movement arose so quickly, there must have been a real, historical Yeshua that catalyzed it early on. The fabricated gods of the pagan world took centuries to fully develop into their final characterization.
- Since we see a good number of seemingly contradictory statements, where different authors seem to disagree with each other on minor points, this further argues for veracity over legend because if the authors were creating a legend, they would have smoothed over all of these contradictions. Just because we find a few problems with the texts, that is no reason to throw out the entire NT as too problematical to accept.

BUT NOT ALL WILL ACCEPT THE NEW TESTAMENT WITH ERRORS

Often when speaking with typical Christians I hear their argument that the apostles were themselves the gospel authors, and that their original writings are more or less exactly as we have them today. As we shall see, both of these premises are naive, unfounded, and haven't been taken seriously by biblical scholars for decades. Yet this is the mentality of the church and too many pastors. To expose these two fallacies, we must look closer at the origins of early Christianity as well as the evolution and historicity of the NT manuscripts.

EVOLUTION AND HISTORICITY OF NEW TESTAMENT MANUSCRIPTS

The manuscripts of the NT were written in Greek. It is argued that there may have existed an Aramaic source for the Synoptic gospels, especially Mark's gospel, but the evidence is still inconclusive. The earliest incomplete texts of the NT (the Beatty papyri and the Bodmer papyri) date from the third century CE. Unfortunately these exist only as tiny fragments of various texts. Papyrus was in use prior to the fourth century and was a very perishable substance. Beginning in the fourth century, the more durable vellum, made from the scraped skin of goats and sheep, quickly replaced papyri as the preferred writing medium. The first complete manuscripts we have (the Codex Vaticanus and the Codex Sinaiticus) date to the fourth century. These complete codices are also in Greek and their dates of composition have been well-established among biblical scholars and linguists. We have no original autographs, extant (existing) fragments or manuscripts which date to the first or second centuries and to the time of Christ. With respect to everything that we know about Yeshua, these manuscripts are our only authority and despite the 300-year gap between these two extant codices and the "real" Yeshua, they will have to suffice.

Before there existed any writings of Yeshua on papyri, stories about Yeshua were spoken orally

between people and communities. If the earliest manuscripts began appearing around 50 CE as many scholars conclude, then the oral tradition, as it is known, preserved the deeds and activities of Yeshua for around 13 years prior to their eventual codification in written form. These "proto-gospels" were copied and reproduced well before the invention of the printing press and so they had to be copied by a scribe, line for line and word for word in a very time consuming and expensive process. In the centuries after Yeshua' death, most people could not afford to own a copy of a gospel themselves and those Christian communities that could afford a copy used only a single gospel that they read aloud to each other on the Sabbath. Since most communities did not own a copy of a gospel, they preserved the teachings and sayings of Yeshua by retelling these stories (oral traditions) to each other. Most of these communities preferred to use only their own gospel tradition and so a proliferation of gospel traditions arose.

It is important to realize that not everything which was preserved in the oral tradition automatically made its way into the written texts. By the end of the second century, early church fathers like Serapion and Irenaeus argued for the acceptance of only four gospels. Irenaeus was especially passionate for acceptance of only the four, but many other bishops and leaders disagreed. It was not at all clear in the second century which of the various forms of Christianity then in existence--Marcionian Paulinism, Montanism, Gnosticism, Soteriology, or Catholicism--could claim a superior criteria of legitimacy. Many early Church Fathers who led these Yeshua movements fought bitterly amongst themselves and each declared the others heretical. Also, each leader preferred his own oral and textual traditions. Papias seems to have been familiar with at least Mark, Matthew and John, but preferred the authority of the continuous and dynamic oral tradition that still circulated instead. Justin Martyr quotes frequently from the early gospels, but also from the oral tradition as well.

Marcion, a colorful church leader preferred his own edited version of Luke where he pulled out all references to the Jews and rejected all other gospels. (Marcion seems to have been aware of the charges of pagan critics like Celsus that the gospels were self-contradictory and so this may have influenced his drastic measure of relying only on Luke.) In one interesting case, a very popular writer named Tatian composed a gospel "harmony" that smoothed out the discrepancies that appeared in the gospels. The Syrian community used Tatian's harmony as their sole gospel until the fifth century. In the end however, Irenaeus' views won. In a now famous passage, Irenaeus declares the reason for choosing no more or fewer than the four gospels: "It is not possible that the gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are, since there are four directions of the world in which we live, and there are four principal winds adv. Haer. 3.11.8)."

By the end of the second century, the first canon had taken shape (Marcion-the "heretic") and from then on the oral tradition slowly died out to be replaced by the authority of the written word.

COMPETING IDEAS OF JESUS AND THEIR LEGACY TODAY

Almost from the beginning this "Yeshua movement" was split among many different communities who each had their own ideas about who Yeshua was and what his teachings meant to them. Over time a "kerygma" emerged, a message "which is proclaimed" (the literal translation of kerygma from the Greek). But it wasn't always clear what this proclamation was in the decades immediately following Yeshua' death since each community enjoyed the freedom to interpret their stories about Yeshua for themselves as they saw fit. Bauer [1934] first realized that this diversity existed throughout the early communities and regions of the Yeshua movement.

Fredriksen [1988] describes these communities and how their diversity played an important role in formulating the kerygma: "Early Christians grouped together, preserving some of Yeshua' teachings and some stories about him, which became part of the substance of their preaching as they continued his mission to prepare Israel for the coming of the Kingdom of God. At the same time or very shortly thereafter, these oral teachings began to circulate orally in Greek as well as in Yeshua' native Aramaic. Eventually, some of Yeshua' sayings, now in Greek, were collected and written down in a document, now lost, which scholars designate "Q" (from the German Quelle, "source" which reportedly were a collection of the oral sayings of Yeshua). Meanwhile, other oral traditions--miracle stories, parables, legends, and so on--grew, circulated, and were collected in different

forms by various Christian communities. NOTICE that up to now we are dealing with an oral tradition among the people concerning Yeshua. In the period around the destruction of the Second Temple (70 CE) an anonymous Gentile Christians wrote some of these down. This person was not an author nor was he a historian--he did not deal directly and critically with his evidence. The writer was an evangelist, a sort of creative editor. He organized these stories into a sequence and shaped his inherited material into something resembling a historical narrative. The result was the Gospel of Mark."

This gospel, written around 70 CE, was the Original Mark. Original Mark was much shorter than Canonical Mark, the Mark which is in the Bible today. It did not contain Canonical Mark's 6:45-8:26 verses or the resurrection appendix of Mark 16:9-20.

Those extra passages not in the Original Mark were "interpolated "(or inserted) after 70 CE, but sometime prior to canonization in the fourth century. What may have happened was that a dominant **community took the gospel and incorporated their own oral traditions into it (this would be done often)**, with the result being passages 6:45 through 8:26. This provided them with a complete codified form of their own values along with the authority of the written gospel, all in one book. In the earliest versions of Mark and Q, Yeshua' resurrection account was not yet included. At some point in the second century however verses 16:9-20, the resurrection account, was included in order to harmonize it with the other gospels. This editorializing was common and acceptable practice in the ancient world.

There existed many different varieties of proto-gospels, each based on the local communities own oral tradition as it was preserved from the time of Yeshua. Although Q is the most famous of these early Sayings Sources (as Q is also called) it was not the only one. The Gospel of Thomas, for example, is based on a more primitive strata of Q; a strata that swapped stories about Yeshua before the apocalyptic expectations that came to be attributed to Yeshua and the "Son of Man" sayings found their way into the Q. In other words the Yeshua sayings--from oral tradition to the final canonized form that we have today--constantly evolved in a dynamic process which reflected the zeal and enthusiasm of the early Christians who preserved them. Robertson remarks on the reasons why it is difficult to separate the various Yeshua traditions from each other: "Within a hundred years from the date commonly assigned to the Crucifixion, there are Gentile traces of a Jesuist or Christ movement deriving from Jewry, and possessing a gospel or memoir as well as some of the Pauline and other epistles, both spurious and genuine; but the gospel then current seems to have contained some matter not preserved in the canonical four, and have lacked much that those contain."

I have heard and read Christians say that the "picture that emerges [from modern scholarship] is one of increasing authentication of the NT by a wide range of scholars."

Answer for yourself: Which picture emerges? Do we stop at a certain point along the evolutionary path of these traditions and say that "here" is where they become authentic?

Answer for yourself: Should we prefer instead to say that the furthest point in time away from the historical Yeshua (earliest record) is the more desirable picture?

Answer for yourself: Let me ask you this: Should we desire after all to obtain the most factual information and portrayal of Yeshua? Should we look at the time frame in which he lived long with its source materials rather than risk these interpolations and insertions of conflicting oral traditions concerning Yeshua that have been added by the Gentile Church from 100-500 C.E.? I hope you said the earlier time will give us a truer picture of Yeshua than when the accounts about him were altered and mixed with created fiction!

If the true "Christian's picture of Yeshua" is to be considered at all, we must first reconcile what we know about the dynamic evolution of the NT texts and determine where we draw the line on authoritativeness in time.

Typical Christian writers today would rather we ignore the evolutionary process of the texts and accept the canonical texts as they exist today (the New Testament) as if they were protected in a vacuum from the time of Christ (which they were not). Can we dare do this without problems which cause us to accept less than the truth? More than that, if we accept "less than the truth" often our conduct and behavior will be "less than the truth" as well.

MY PERPLEXITY WITH THE TYPICAL CHRISTIAN

What saddens me is that when Christians are informed of the "creative evolutionary process" which went into the creating of a contemporary Yeshua (which is 180 degrees opposite of the real Yeshua of history), they almost unanimously prefer this vacuum to an otherwise rational exegesis and understanding. In other words, too many will not repent of their erroneous beliefs and conduct when shown they are in error.

Answer for yourself: Does the truth matter? Does our obedience matter?

That the disciples' names are attached to two of the four gospels in no way indicates that they were the actual authors. The headings which read "The Gospel according to . . ." were second-century additions called "pseudepigraphia"--authorship by an anonymous person which is then attributed to a famous biblical character for authority. Pseudepigraphical works flourished in ancient Palestine from two centuries before Yeshua to around 300 CE after. The unknown Jewish and early Christian authors of pseudepigraphical works felt that, while they themselves had something important to say, their material might not be taken seriously unless it seemed to come from the pen of a famous person such as a disciple or a prophet. All four of the gospels are pseudepigraphical works and today we use the names "Matthew" or "John" merely as convenient labels for the work. It is particularly disturbing to see the multitude of uniformed Christians advocating disciple-authorship of John's and Matthew's gospels because this kind of propaganda clouds the real truth and damages the reputation of Christian apologetics.

Sellew [1991] reviews the modern perspective on the evolution of the Yeshua teachings which formed the four gospels and the Acts of the Apostles. Let's look closely at the earliest gospel upon which Matthew and Luke were based, the Gospel of Mark.

CHRONOLOGICAL EVOLUTION OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK

As we see from Mark's history, it is not so simple a matter as claiming that Canonical Mark in the fourth century contains an "underlying eyewitness account" of the events that occurred in first century Judea. The author of Original Mark had never even met Yeshua and probably wrote in Rome. Two chapters were interpolated in Augmented Mark (6:45-8:26) as well as the entire resurrection account of Yeshua (16:9-20). Two strata of the manuscript later and we end up with the gospel that we know today. Matthew and Luke are almost entirely based upon pre-canonical versions of Mark and the late stage of Q. These gospels could and did change over time (additions and deletions). Sometimes the changes were subtle, other times sweeping and even of a different genre as Kee states: "Justin Martyr (100-165 CE) relying on the testimony of Papias refers to the gospel of Mark as the "memoir" of Peter. . . . It must be acknowledged that the gospels as we have them today do not match the description that Justin Martyr offered for them in the middle of the second century A.D. The gospel of Mark is not a "memoir" of Peter, either in the sense that it recounts in a special way the associations of Peter with Yeshua or in the sense that Mark reports first-hand recollections about Yeshua. The material on which Mark drew passed through a long process of retelling and modification and interpretation, and it reflects less special interest in Peter than does Matthew's gospel."

SYNOPTIC PROBLEM

Many seem to quickly gloss over the heavy dependence that Matthew and Luke have on Mark and Q (oral

traditions that circulated in the first century) . They claim that "most of the NT documents were written with minimal influence between each other . . . they share some data, but show a very independent development path." In saying this they pay some tribute to the Synoptic problem--as the Luke/Matthew dependence on Q and Mark is called--but only in passing as if to hastily wave it aside. But, are we to believe that the gospels are creations with "very independent development?"

The Q material is present in nearly 200 verses in both Matthew and Luke. Also, out of Mark's 661 total verses all except thirty-one are paralleled or repeated in Luke and Matthew. Thus the assertion that the Synoptics exert "minimal influence on each other" can hardly be supported. Considering that Luke and Matthew were written anonymously much later than Yeshua and by Gentiles who did not know Yeshua personally, it can hardly be attested that they "constitute 5-8 independent witnesses to the base set of miracles." Merely retelling an older tale does not constitute being a witness to anything first hand.

Compounding the problem of which portions of the NT texts are authentic to the time of Yeshua is the grim fact that the texts changed so much over the centuries. As I stated earlier, scribes had to copy the texts from one scroll to another and text critics have found numerous errors, both intentional and unintentional, that have crept into each subsequent copy. The conservative scholars Westcott and Hort have listed over 250 suspected or rejected readings in the canonical gospels and Acts. Let me say I can excuse and forgive UNINTENTIONAL errors and changes because to err is human, but what I struggle with is the fact that what God originally intended I be taught and live out was altered by less than "holy men of old" who corrupted the revelation intended for me and you, thus creating a substitute revelation that served their flesh and their bigotry. That is a fact and in undeniable if only you will examine the evidence for yourself.

Enslin still speaks authoritatively to this point:

"Before an ancient writing can speak for itself, can tell of its author's outlook on life, and the situation that confronted him, we must have that writing in the form in which it was originally written. . . . during the centuries that elapsed between the time of composition and the appearance of our earliest manuscripts the writings had been frequently copied. As a result numerous changes had been made, both intentional and accidental. But not alone minute changes such as alteration in spelling or word order, but more drastic alterations occur. . . . Hence the question of "integrity" is of great importance.

By this is meant simply: Is the book as we possess it exactly the same as it was when it left the author's hand?" Sadly no.

If we are to explore the veracity of the texts in the manner in which they are currently interpreted by Christianity, then we must try to discover what the original author wanted to say. Even though the gospels (which purport to speak authoritatively on Yeshua) are not first-hand accounts of his deeds and activities, they were based in part on earlier traditions that were closer to the historical Yeshua. Our job should not be to ignore the problems of the texts as some seem to do, but to separate the later interpolations (insertions) from the earlier Yeshua traditions in order to study them more easily. We must not choose an "all or nothing" mentality or a "lump and dump" technique for our study of the documents.

Even this detailed analysis is no guarantee of authenticity of the gospels themselves as seen by the "scanty" use of the gospels "by the Christians even a hundred years after Yeshua' death" is "amazing," and "would appear to justify the view that when these gospels appeared they were by no means accorded universal acclaim." This should be a warning to the church today to be cautious in trusting all in the New Testament as "fact," thus all the more reason to study to show ourselves approved, thus verifying that we be in "the faith" and not practicing "another gospel."

Especially compounding the problem of individual gospel integrity was the formulation of the canon in the second century; first by an anti-Semitic heretic, and then the reaction to him by the Catholic Church from 180 C.E. to 390 C.E.. Once the emerging four gospels began to be considered as a cohesive unit and were circulated together, scribes who became used to seeing them together passively harmonized them when discrepancies were found. There is only one problem...conflicting oral traditions from different sources and communities were not always correct, and much of them were incorporated within written documents we have come to consider as valid "Scripture." The mixing of paganism and Judaism in oral traditions which were later written down by Gentiles were NEVER intended to be considered Scripture by God let alone used as authority for our faith since we already possessed such in the Law and the Prophets as the early Jewish church and Yeshua attests.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE GOSPEL OF MARK AND HOW AUTHORITATIVE ARE THOSE EXTRA PASSAGES IN THE LATER GOSPELS?

The evolution of the Gospel of Mark, the earliest of the Synoptic gospels, was born with a real, historical Yeshua, the man who gave them life to begin with. After Yeshua's death, the stories and tales about him spread rapidly from community to community. Eventually some of these stories were written down or "codified" on scrolls of papyrus in a long lost work we now call Q. A few decades later our first gospel appears with a little more material added in order to fill in the gaps about Yeshua that the oral tradition did not contain. Throughout all of this process one pattern is clear: with each new strata a little bit more material was added in an "upside down pyramid" fashion. The earliest version of the Q lacked the "Son of man" and "kingdom of God" material that became a part of the later Q. In turn, the later Q, lacked the resurrection accounts of Yeshua that became a part of Augmented Mark. Augmented Mark lacks still more material that shows up in Matthew and Luke and so on. There is a tendency among conservative scholars today to gloss over this very real evolution of the texts and to pretend that the developed canon differs little, if at all, from the early stages of the Yeshua movement. Such is not true. This tendency is extremely short-sighted and leads only to confusion.

The question we should ask ourselves is "How authoritative are those extra passages in later gospels?"

Do we want to strive to get closer to the core of Q where the historical Yeshua resides? Or do we instead prefer the post-Easter interpretations of later anti-Semitic Gentile writers who developed a Christology on top of the historical Yeshua and Q source? You may not know it but our churches today are filled with the second option of a fictitious creation of a post-Easter Yeshua that never existed the way he is portrayed.

THE MIRACLE ACCOUNTS

Several place an extraordinary emphasis on Yeshua's miracle accounts as evidence for the NT texts authenticity. They claim variously that "the very manner in which the miracles are recounted provide an argument for their authenticity" and that the earliest extra-biblical sources "never dispute the fact of his miracles." They argue that because Yeshua's miracle claims are modest in number as well as execution and that they exist in the core sayings of Q, that they render everything that Yeshua was later said to have done with "carte blanche" validity as well.

It is true that Mark's gospel, even from the early stages, places an emphasis on Yeshua's miracles. But this does not render all of the material that made its way into the canon during the next three centuries that purports to tell us something about Yeshua as equally valid.

There exists two modern-day misconceptions concerning the miracle accounts of ancient writers. The first misconception is prevalent in secular society and assumes that since we know today that miracles are impossible, then the ancients must have "made it up." The second misconception is that Yeshua's miracles indicate that he was a divine god and therefore we should take the NT and his teachings as more authoritative than other writings. Both misconceptions aggravate each other and each commit the fallacy of hindsight--the luxury to look back and impose on past societies, the knowledge that we take for granted now. These misconceptions fail to consider the cultural context of that period of time in history. If we entertain these misconceptions we risk losing sight of what the ancients really thought about their world and the place of miracles in it.

For the Hellenistic world as well as the Jewish one, miracles were not only possible, they were quite normal and expected from prophets and holy men. It was believed that various gods routinely intervened into the affairs of humankind for the purposes of changing history or to reveal their wishes. Mental illness wasn't understood as we know it now. A person who suffered from what we would now

call epilepsy, was thought by the ancients to be demonically possessed. Josephus tells us quite unequivocally that Jews inherited the "Wisdom of Solomon" and therefore were especially adept at miracle-working and cures. Jewish miracle-working was world-renowned. Josephus tells the story of how King Solomon himself told how to perform healings. Josephus describes Eleazar, an exorcist and one of those descendants of Solomon's techniques: "I have seen a certain man of my own country whose name was Eleazar, releasing people that were demoniacal in the presence of Vespasian . . . He put a ring that had a root of one of those sorts mentioned by Solomon to the nostrils of the demoniac, after which he drew out the demon through his nostrils; and when the man fell down immediately, he abjured him to return into him no more . . . when Eleazar would persuade and demonstrate to the spectators that he had such a power, he set a little way off a cup or basin full of water, and commanded the demon, as he went out of the man, to overturn it, and thereby let the spectators know that [the demon] had left the man." ("Antiquities" 8.2.5)

It does not contextually follow that just because Yeshua performed miracles, he was considered divine and indeed we do not find this to be the case among the earliest of Christians. The assertion that "Yeshua's wide variety of miracles" were performed "on his own" authority, without including rain-making is just not true. Israel was full of Jewish miracle-workers, healers, and magicians that roamed ancient Palestine. Only the Egyptians were regarded higher than the Jews for their miracle and healing abilities. Yeshua's own miracles were well within the context of the period. Any wandering rabbi who was worth his salt would of had a full repertoire of miracles to work and perform among the villagers that he encountered. This is the proper context to view Yeshua's miracles in not, as some infer, as some sort of prerequisite for divinity. As Sanders [1993] points out: "It is difficult to discuss Yeshua's miracles historically, however, because convictions about what Christians believe or should believe interfere very strongly. . . . Yeshua's miracles are to be studied in the light of other miracles of his day, not in the context of the subsequent Christian doctrine that he was both human and divine. . . . The early Christians thought that Yeshua was the Messiah, the Son of God, "and" a miracle-worker. Interestingly early Christians pictured Yeshua as a "magician". In cave motifs depicting the raising up of Lazarus, Yeshua always holds a magic wand and is motioning with it when calling Lazarus out from the burial cave.

This had led many modern Christians to think that first-century Jews looked for a Messiah who performed miracles, and that Yeshua's contemporaries would conclude that a miracle-worker was the Messiah. This view is incorrect."

For many modern Christians, Yeshua's miracles are no longer seen in the historical context in which they occurred. They treat these miracle accounts as if they alone represent historical validity for all NT texts. There is no argument that from the earliest strata Yeshua is credited with performing many miracles. The argument is that these demonstrations by Yeshua somehow lend authenticity to the NT. When we consider the account of Eleazar's exorcism in "Antiquities", we do not consider Josephus' work to be either fraudulent or divinely-inspired. Josephus is merely a product of the context of his time; a time when many people believed that miracles, exorcisms, and healings occurred with regularity. We must also look at the NT in this same fashion

rather than assign either more or less importance to Yeshua' miracle accounts than they were meant to be taken when written.

If the argument is to take on a characteristic that says that Yeshua' miracle-accounts indicate that he was the Messiah or a god, then we must immediately object to this as well. The questions of Yeshua' divinity did not even arise until the second century.

Historically, we have already seen how miracle-workers were not divine, but ordinary human beings. There was no expectation among the Jews for a Messiah who would perform miracles. The Messiah's role was be largely political since he was expected to restore the kingdoms of Israel by military force. Yeshua' own miracles were not seen by his contemporaries as evidence for divinity or the Messiah; miracles were seen within the context of their day as indicative of a well-learned rabbi or in Yeshua' case, a skilled magician.

CONCLUSION

Discussions of the historical origins of early Christianity have filled whole books. This article is not meant to substitute for the exhaustive research of others to which I owe much here. This article is meant only to rebut the overly simplistic argument of accepting the New Testament as if created infallible and inerrant in a "vacuum," as well as "discarding it" because it can be shown to have numerous inaccuracies and errors within it. To do either as an approach to our faith and the canonical texts of the NT is a gross error. Hopefully I have made it clear that modern biblical scholarship has moved away from such a false position of "infallibility and inerrancy" that uninformed pastors and their congregations may yet hold. Instead, those who desire to know realize that the NT evolved in a dynamic process throughout the many centuries leading up to their final canonization. It would not speak well of Christianity if its texts did not change during those formative years prior to canonization; only dogmas and ideologies are cut into stone. Dynamic, passionate movements require constant reflection and interpretation if they are to flower and grow.

Although we are not likely to ever get a clear picture of who the real historical Yeshua really was due to the layers of material that were later added, **we can come pretty close through honest inquiry.** A consensus of critical scholarship outlines for us the most realistic picture of Yeshua through purely form-critical means of inquiry. Although not authoritative by any means, it does represent most of the common elements that modern scholarship has come to accept in discovering who the historical Yeshua really was: "Yeshua appeared on the Palestinian scene as an itinerant teacher, probably self-taught, so there was deep resentment of his authoritative manner among the official religious leadership of Palestine. He held his central mission to be the announcement of the imminent coming of God's Kingdom, and he regarded his extraordinary powers of healing and exorcism as evidence that the powers of the Kingdom were already breaking into the present situation...It was through the false charge that he was a revolutionary that he was put to death by the Romans--a charge brought by the religious leaders whose authority his pronouncements seemed to threaten."

After that time the Jewish as well as Gentile post-Easter Christian community slowly arrived at an interpretation of what their Messiah's death meant to them. They disagreed. This took on various forms that are beyond the scope of this essay, but in 451 CE the Chalcedonian Definition finally transformed Yeshua into the divine god that most Christians are familiar with today. Despite these subsequent layers of interpolation, the upstart Jewish rabbi who changed the ancient world can still be extracted from those texts and appreciated within the proper context of history if so desired. I hope this article stimulates your thinking and your study. Let us not be so unkind to discard that corpus of literature that is so very valuable in our search for the historical Yeshua....the less than reliable New Testament that is far from inerrant and infallible. That being the case, it yet remains the most important resource we have if we try to discover the "Christ of history" and separate him from the "Christ of faith." Thus, to treat the New Testament with an "all or nothing" mentality only shows one's irrational approach to the NT texts.

My desire for you dear brother and sister in the Lord is not to let your insecurity caused by further study or stubborn pride and blindness to truth rob you of the quest for the historical Yeshua. If you

what should we do with an unreliable new testament?

desire to know more in order to be more please to God, please contact us at the bottom address.

Shalom.



SO YOU THOUGHT YOU WERE A FOLLOWER OF JESUS.....YOU MIGHT NEED TO RECONSIDER

Let me begin with a quote from the New Testament...from an epistle written to non-Jews like most of our readers.

2 Cor. 13:5

Examine yourselves, whether ye be in the faith; prove your ownelves.....

I think that this is a very good idea to prove to ourselves that what we believe is true; in fact I have practiced self-examination of such religious beliefs in light of the facts regarding the “real historical Yeshua” for over a decade. Because of such self-examination in light of my discoveries as I combed through 2000 years of Biblical history, culture, as well as in-depth analysis of Biblical language, I have been forced to change much of my religious belief system along the way. It is my desire that this article challenge you to scrutinize your religious beliefs as I have been challenged over the years. May G-d witness truth to your soul.

Answer for yourself: Was Yeshua a Christian and would he ascribe today to the vast majority of doctrines taught in his name in churches which go by his name as well?

Well let us investigate. But first we need to set the stage for what is coming next. Try and be as honest with yourself as possible in answering these next questions.

TO WHICH RELIGION WOULD A PERSON BE A MEMBER IF HE DID THE FOLLOWING?

- Was circumcised on the eighth day.
- Kept Sabbath from Friday sundown to Saturday sundown.
- Attended a synagogue regularly.
- Kept the Biblical Festivals such as Passover, Hag Ha Matzah (Unleavened Bread), Shavuot (Pentecost), Rosh HaShanah, Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement), Sukkoth (Tabernacles) and Hanukkah.
- Was a citizen and friend of Israel and believed Israel is the example for all non-Jewish people in the world
- His Bible contained the Torah, the Prophets and the Writings ONLY!
- Quoted passages as authoritative from the Mishnah (the Oral Law).
- Taught that Deuteronomy 6:4 was the most important commandment.
- Wore a tallith and phylacteries in religious services
- Did not eat unclean foods
- Taught the eternalness of G-d's Covenants and His Laws

- **Taught that faith without works is no faith at all**
- **Taught that salvation is more concerned with events in the here and now than what occurs beyond the grave**

I suppose that most of you came up with the same answer.....you don't have to be a scholar to recognize that one that practiced such a faith does not practice Christianity.....he holds to the teachings of Judaism.

NOW, LET'S TAKE A LOOK AT ANOTHER PERSON. SEE IF YOU CAN IDENTIFY THE RELIGION OF THIS PERSON

- **Keeps the Sabbath on Sunday which is the legacy of Sun worship today.**
- **Attends a church which most likely rejects most things Jewish.**
- **Keeps Easter and Christmas which were pagan festivals made to look religious to those who don't know the difference.**
- **Carries a Bible containing an Old Testament and a New Testament which ironically contradicts the Old.**
- **Stresses a person's beliefs over his actions.**
- **Teaches that people had to be "saved" by acknowledging a creed or an established set of beliefs in order to go to heaven.**
- **Teaches that they are not under the law and that the Law has passed away and they are under grace.**
- **Teaches that the church had replaced Israel as G-d's people and sees itself as the fulfillment of prophecies given to Israel.**
- **Teaches that you can eat anything...even Biblically unclean foods**
- **Attaches no special significance to circumcision**

I bet you got the right answer again – a Christian.

GOING DEEPER THAN YOU POSSIBLY HAVE EVEN GONE BEFORE

Now let's take this discussion one more step by answering this question.

Answer for yourself: If a Jew wanted to become a member of a Christian religion could he continue practicing Judaism in the church?

The answer is so simple. You would only have to ask your Pastor that one question to get the answer. Probably in the 99.9% of the cases the answer would be - NO!

TURN ABOUT IS FAIR PLAY

Answer for yourself: If a Christian wanted to become a convert to Judaism could he continue practicing Christianity and the items listed above? Again the answer is rather obvious.

Now, the percentage moves upwards, probably in 100% of the cases the answer would be - NO!

It is very apparent that not only are Judaism and Christianity different religions, they are exclusive in many ways. This reveals an amazing fact which can be seen by asking one very simple question –

WHICH RELIGION DID YESHUA BELONG TO...CHRISTIANITY OR

JUDAISM?

- Was circumcised on the eighth day.
- Kept Sabbath from Friday sundown to Saturday sundown.
- Attended a synagogue regularly.
- Kept the Biblical Festivals such as Passover, Hag Ha Matzah (Unleavened Bread), Shavuot (Pentecost), Rosh HaShanah, Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement), Sukkoth (Tabernacles) and Hanukkah.
- Was a citizen and friend of Israel and believed Israel is the example for all non-Jewish people in the world
- His Bible contained the Torah, the Prophets and the Writings ONLY!
- Quoted passages as authoritative from the Mishnah (the Oral Law).
- Taught that Deuteronomy 6:4 was the most important commandment.
- Wore a tallith and phylacteries in religious services
- Did not eat unclean foods
- Taught the eternalness of G-d's Covenants and His Laws
- Taught that faith without works is no faith at all
- Taught that salvation is more concerned with events in the here and now than what occurs beyond the grave

Now for the easy part. The answer to the above question is a matter of historical record which is easily attested to by the New Testament itself-- Yeshua was a Jew, not a Christian and he was certainly not both. It is clear that Yeshua was a practicing Jew who lived a very observant Jewish life-style.

In fact we cannot find any instance whatsoever where Yeshua ever: Kept the Sabbath on Sunday, attended or affiliated with any group which rejected things Jewish, kept the pagan festival of Ishtar/Easter or the sun god's birthday (Saturnalia...December 25th....Christmas) which were pagan festivals made to look religious to us today, ever taught anything that contradicted the Old Testament as does much in the New Testament, ever stressed a person's beliefs over his actions, ever taught that people had to be "saved" by acknowledging a creed or an established set of beliefs in order to go to heaven, ever taught that people are not under the law or that the Law had passed away and they were under grace alone, ever taught that the church had replaced Israel as G-d's people, and ever taught that you can eat anything...even Biblically unclean foods.

YESHUA NEVER RENOUNCED JUDAISM OR QUIT BEING A JEW

An amazing discovery for any Christian is the fact that there is simply no evidence that Yeshua ever renounced Judaism and quit being a Jew. Also, his teachings do not indicate that he ever wanted any Jew to renounce their Judaism and join a new religion. If this revelation every breaks into your conscious mind then you will have to confront Gentile Christianity for what it has actually become despite Yeshua's wishes or example set for us.

Answer for yourself: How then, did Yeshua get credited with the distinct label that he was the person responsible for creating a new religion?

Answer for yourself: How did Yeshua get credit for creating another religion which opposed the religion and way of life he continued to live...even up to his death?

Let us try to answer questions raised by such an assumption:

LOOKING THROUGH THE EYES OF A JEWISH RABBI NAMED YESHUA

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi prohibit circumcision or downplay its significance?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi change the Sabbath to another day...let alone to the day set aside for sun worship by the pagans?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi create a replacement for the synagogue?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi substitute a pagan feast which was clearly idolatrous, Ishtar (Easter), for Passover?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi want his followers to celebrate the birth of a Roman god (Saturnalia -- December 25)?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi teach his students to not keep the biblical commandments or that they no longer applied when G-d already said they were forever?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi teach Gentiles to hate Jews?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi add books to the Torah in spite of the warning in Deuteronomy forbidding the changing or adding to the Word of G-d?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi replace Deuteronomy 6:4 as the most important commandment?

Answer for yourself: Would a rabbi teach Gentiles that it is permissible to eat unclean food when Noah, himself a non-Jew separated animals based on the principle of clean/unclean long before there were any Jews?

The answer to all the above questions is that a rabbi wouldn't, and that includes a rabbi named Yeshua!

TOUGH - THOUGHT PROVOKING QUESTIONS YOU NEED TO ANSWER FOR YOURSELF

Answer for yourself: If Yeshua didn't create a new anti-Jewish religion, who did?

Answer for yourself: Who is responsible and what were their motives in replacing the faith of Yeshua with a faith about Yeshua?

Answer for yourself: Was it the men who acquired leadership after Yeshua's departure and the death of the Apostles who did such a thing?

Answer for yourself: Were those responsible for changing the faith of Yeshua actually Jews or Non-Jews and were their motives in changing Jewish doctrines consistent with anti-Semitism?

Answer for yourself: Did they continue teaching Yeshua's message and his gospel or did they change Yeshua's message in places, and are you, at the present not yet aware of it at your present level of knowledge?

THE BOOK OF ACTS PAINTS US A PICTURE WE WOULD DO WELL TO EXAMINE CLOSELY

The book of Acts provides us with some very valuable information too long overlooked by most Christians. Acts 21:17-25 records Paul's return to Jerusalem and his meeting with the leaders of the "church." Keep in mind that these were the men who had been personally taught by and lived with Yeshua. Their words provide us with

some very enlightening information. The translation given below is based on a cultural and historical methodology. Your translation most probably reflects the doctrines of the Roman church and therefore may differ.

"You see, brother (referring to the Apostle Paul), how many thousands of Jews have become faithful (observant). All of them are zealous for the Torah (Law). They have been informed that you have taught the Jews of the Diaspora to not keep the Torah, that they should not circumcise their children or live according to the Jewish religion.... Take these men and do the following... so that everybody will know that there is no truth in these reports about your teachings, but that you yourself are living an observant life-style and keeping the Torah."

REMEMBERING THAT THIS IS A PICTURE OF JESUS' CHURCH.....

A quick summary provides us with some very significant information. Understanding that this passage reflects events which occurred long after Yeshua's death then I ask you to be truthful to the text as well as yourself in asking yourself this: Is your church producing the same results?

- Jews who believe in Yeshua are becoming more faithful (observant to the Law) because of the message taught by Yeshua's followers.
- The message of Yeshua's church caused adherents to become zealous for the Torah (Law).
- The members of Yeshua's church kept the Laws of Moses (the Torah).
- The members of Yeshua's church circumcised their children.
- The members of Yeshua's church lived according to the traditions of the elders of Judaism (the Jewish religion).

Notice that Paul did as he was requested - Paul example, at least while he was in Jerusalem under the watchful eyes of the Apostles, wasn't teaching the Jews to abandon their religion. On the contrary, Paul's behavior and example was one as "under the law" and as one who lived an observant Jewish life-style.

Answer for yourself: How then could he have been the author of a doctrine that advocated rejecting the law as is ascribed to him by most Christians today?

Answer for yourself: Not meaning to over-stress this point, but are you really getting the importance of this message as taught by Yeshua's church in Palestine?

IS YOUR CHURCH PREACHING THE SAME GOSPEL AND MESSAGE AS YESHUA'S CHURCH?

Again looking at Acts 21 for our information.....let us examine what we are taught by this New Testament picture:

- The message of the apostles caused Jews to repent and become observant Jews who practiced Judaism faithfully.
- The apostles were causing Jews to become eager for the Torah and to pursue it with fervor. It is

clear that they were not teaching them that "they were under grace and no longer under the law" or that "the law has passed away after Yeshua's death" as we have been told today. This one point is in complete opposition to most fundamental teaching of every modern Christian doctrine.

- The Jewish members of the early church continued to circumcise their children. In other words, they continued to see themselves as participant's in the Abrahamic Covenant, just as every practicing Jew does today. Their children were Jews, not members of some new mystical religion that replaced Judaism.
- The Jewish members of the early church continued to practice Judaism. They did not switch to a new religion.

HOW ARE WE TO INTERPRET PAUL'S ACTIONS?

When we look at Paul's actions, after being ordered by James to take several men with him to the Temple, thereby paying for their animal sacrifices in order to prove that he was an observant Jew by bringing blood sacrifices and sin offerings necessary in finishing his Nazarite vow, we are faced with two possibilities: (A) Paul intentionally deceived the apostles and the Jews in Jerusalem; or, (B) Paul's image and/or the teachings attributed Paul may have been altered by the Roman Church a hundred or more years later.

Answer for yourself: Did Paul intentionally deceive the apostles by faking his true beliefs when bringing sacrifices in the Temple after Yeshua's death?

Answer for yourself: If Paul did deceive them, could you put much confidence in his teachings at other places in the New Testament? Remember he already has said that he can become anything to anyone to prove his argument and accomplish his goals.

Answer for yourself: On the other hand, if Paul's words were changed by the Roman Church could we base our foundational beliefs on forged documents?

Christianity, almost universally, requires a Jew to convert to Christianity before he can become a member of the church or be saved. This conversion process forces the Jew to renounce his or her Judaism and terminate or redefine many Biblical and Jewish practices.

Having read this article so far, please think deeply while answering these next questions:

Answer for yourself: Would your church require a Jew to renounce or stop practicing Judaism if he or she wanted to become a member?

Answer for yourself: How many circumcisions have you attended for the children of Jewish members of your church?

Answer for yourself: How many of your church's members are Jewish and are zealous for the Torah and are pursuing it with fervor?

Answer for yourself: Does your church conduct at least one Torah study per week?

Answer for yourself: How many of your church's Jewish members are observant Jews?

Answer for yourself: When was the last time you attended a Passover Seder, or a Rosh HaShanah or Yom Kippur service at your church?

Answer for yourself: Do you have a rabbi or a minister well educated in the Hebraic Roots of Christianity leading your church?

Your answers to the above questions are probably -- Yes, None, None, No, None, Never and Minister.

I want you take some time to think about the next question before you answer it.

Answer for yourself: What would your church require a rabbi to do if he applied for membership?

Answer for yourself: Would they allow him to continue to be a rabbi, practice Judaism, teach the Torah, wear his prayer shawl, observe all the Jewish festivals and teach the members that they were under the Law?

Answer for yourself: *What if that rabbi was Yeshua?*

Are you beginning to see the truth?

Without a great deal of effort it becomes glaringly apparent that neither Rabbi Yeshua, the apostles nor the Paul of Acts 21, would be allowed to join a Christian Church the likes of which we see today. On the other hand, it is also clear that Rabbi Yeshua would not participate in any religion that not only opposes, but is actively dedicated to destroying his Father's religion!

Gentile Christianity has for centuries felt it was given a mandate from G-d to "save the world." This is the goal and stated mission of Christianity.

THE SILENT SLAUGHTER OF TRUTH

Answer for yourself: How is this mission to "save the world" to be accomplished?

Just ask the Southern Baptist Convention who just last year vowed to win every Jew to Yeshua by the year 2000. To put it very simply, the goal is to convert every Jew (non-Christian) to Christianity. The Jewish convert must renounce his Judaism (or any non-Christian religion he may hold), agree to accept the doctrines of Gentile Christianity and oppose any religion that opposes Gentile Christianity.

Instead of a physical holy war (Jihad), Gentile Christianity has engaged in a doctrinal holy war. As I stated above, Christianity is an exclusive religion. Christians are not allowed to simultaneously practice Islam, Buddhism, Judaism or any other religion. Therefore, if Christianity was to attain its goal of "getting every person on the face of the earth to believe in Yeshua," including all the Jews, Judaism would be totally destroyed and cease to exist. If this were ever to happen, and I pray it does not, then Christianity would have the dubious honor which Hitler in vain tried to achieve; namely the eradication of not only the Jewish people from the face of this planet, but the total destruction of the true faith of Yeshua...Biblical Judaism.

This would accomplish something that the crusaders, the inquisition, Hitler and a number of others have failed to accomplish.

Answer for yourself: How do you think a Jewish Yeshua would react to the idea that such a mission was being carried out in his name?

This really gets weird when you think about it! Christians base their proof for their ultimate salvation on a Jewish rabbi named Yeshua (Jesus), who was an observant Jew who faithfully practiced Judaism. On the one hand, his religion would most probably not allow him to practice modern Christianity. On the other hand, modern Christianity would not allow him to practice its religion without first renouncing his religion -- Judaism!

This should present a very important challenge to every Christian:

If a Jewish Yeshua could not, and would not, practice a religion dedicated to

destroying his religion, how can anyone who bases their salvation on Rabbi Yeshua participate in and perpetuate it?

Answer for yourself: Would Rabbi Yeshua agree with the church's salvation message which is based on such a system? Are you getting the drift of this discussion?

Answer for yourself: How did the religion that Rabbi Yeshua and his followers practice evolve into what it is today? To begin to unravel this problem lets ask how a religion whose foundational position focused on teaching its members "to keep the Law" became a religion whose main message was that "members are no longer under the Law."

Early Christian writers taught that the Law had been fulfilled with the coming of Yeshua. Fulfilled, as they defined it, meant that it had been canceled and therefore was of no importance to Christians. However, to Rabbi Yeshua, "fulfilled" meant (1) to keep the Law; and (2) to correctly interpret the teachings of the Bible. There is absolutely nothing said by Rabbi Yeshua that would support modern Christianity's doctrine of grace.

Next, the Roman Christian leaders focused on the story of G-d's unconditional and unending support. However, they claimed that this was something new and was created when G-d made a new covenant of grace. Again, this was unknown to Rabbi Yeshua and his apostles. Early Gentile Christian leaders and theologians continued to develop their new doctrines from the mid-second century on through the seventh century. As they refined their arguments they became much more antagonistic toward Judaism.

This Gentile anti-Judaic movement spanned almost all of Christianity -- from the Roman African communities represented by Tertullian (160-220 C.E.), to the Iranian monk Aphrahat (300-350 C.E.) of the eastern Syriac Christian tradition, and to Bishop John Chrysostom (349-400 C.E.) in Antioch.

Studies have clearly shown the extent to which leaders of the early church attacked Judaism for its position on the law, calling Jews "slavish adherents to the letter of the law." They claimed that Judaism was allowed to continue to exist primarily as an example of degradation.

Answer for yourself: What do you think that rabbi Yeshua would have thought about that position?

Origin, the third-century leader of the Christian community in Caesarea, summed up the difference between Judaism's and Roman Christianity's approaches to Scripture:

"It seems necessary also to explain how certain people by failing to read or understand Scripture correctly have given themselves up to a great many errors, since the way one ought to approach the understanding of divine letters is unknown to a great many people. And so, the Jews, through the hardness of their heart and because they wish to seem wise in themselves, have not believed in our Lord and Savior...."

Now the reason that those we have just mentioned [Jews and heretical Christians] have a false understanding of these matters is quite simply that they understand Scripture not according to the spiritual meaning but according to the sound of the letter...."

[But] a person ought to describe threefold in his soul the meaning of divine

letters, that is, so that the simple may be edified by, so to speak, the body of the Scriptures; for that is what we call the ordinary and narrative meaning.

But if any have begun to make some progress and can contemplate something more fully, they should be edified by the soul of Scripture. And those who are perfect... should be edified by that spiritual Law (Rom. 7:14) which has a shadow of the good things to come (Heb. 10:1), edified by the spirit of Scripture. Thus, just as a human being is said to be made up of body, soul, and spirit, so also is sacred Scripture, which has been granted by G-d's gracious dispensation for man's salvation."

This new scheme for reading Scripture, and the charge that Jews miss all but the literal meaning, made for powerful arguments. Origin's dichotomy between "letter" and "spirit," or in other words, between reading biblical materials either at their face value for norms of behavior and as a more generalized stance toward the world, set the stage throughout history for Christians to increase the fervor of the charge of legalism. Legalism became synonymous with Jewish, and therefore was viewed in a negative light. However, the word "legalism" simply means someone that "lives in accordance with or adheres to a legal system."

Answer for yourself: What would you call someone who "did not adhere to or live in accordance with a legal system"-- a Christian? The products of this anti-Jewish tradition still shapes the thoughts of over 1.6 billion Christians regarding Judaic law.

I am challenging every Christian to make a decision to return to the religion, teachings and life-style expounded by Rabbi Yeshua. Don't misunderstand what I am saying; I am not advocating adopting and accepting the current "theology or faith" about Yeshua; rather, return to the real faith of Yeshua and the place within it for the Gentile G-dfearer. As I stated above, according to the book of Acts, your conversion experience to the faith of the Apostolic church of Yeshua as seen in Acts 21 should have made you zealous for the Torah and brought you back to an observant Biblical life-style as defined by the commandments of G-d.

Answer for yourself: Has it?

Becoming a member of Rabbi Yeshua's movement should have caused you to become a serious student of the Torah. You should be teaching the Torah to others, especially the flood of Gentiles who are coming to you to be taught.

Answer for yourself: Has it?

Answer for yourself: Is there any other way for you to be a "light to the Gentiles?"

If you are a Gentile, you will also need to take a very close look at Acts 15. Gentiles who were coming to the movement originated by Rabbi Yeshua were given very special instructions. First they were to place themselves under specific laws. For all practical purposes those laws were the Ten Commandments. Of special importance was their keeping the Jewish Sabbath and studying the Torah at the synagogue with the Jews.

Keeping the Jewish Sabbath is something that you can do immediately, however; many of you may find it difficult to locate a synagogue where you will be allowed to study the Torah. For very good reasons, after thousands of years of persecutions, the Jewish community is very cautious. I believe that as Christian Jews return to the synagogue, because of the teachings of Rabbi Yeshua, the doors will be opened wider to Gentiles desiring to know the G-d of Rabbi Yeshua.

Two things must be kept in mind as both Jews and Gentile Christians choose to return to the teachings of rabbi

Yeshua. First, almost two thousand years of conflict between Judaism and Christianity has left many scars. Both religions have developed reactionary doctrines and theologies. A reactionary doctrine created as a reaction to the another religion's actions or doctrines.

An example would be the Jewish position concerning kneeling for prayer. Because Christians knelt for prayer, the Jews took the position that they should no longer kneel but stand for prayers. Judaism altered its form of worship because of this practice of Christianity. There have been many reactionary doctrines created both between and within both religions. This is an area of research that deserves much attention. I would challenge my readers to consider such a research project.

It must be kept in mind that the Judaism of Yeshua is not exactly the same as the Judaism of today. Also, the movement attributed to Yeshua is not the same as modern Christianity. Obviously, many things have taken place since the time of Yeshua which resulted in the separation and numerous differences between the two religions.

It is of the utmost importance for both Christians and Jews to understand these changes. You must know when the changes were made, identify the people who were responsible for making the changes, and discover why they made them. You must come to an understanding which changes were motivated by inspiration, which were produced by the hunger for power and wealth and which were the results of human frailties such as anger, rejection, fear and hatred.

As you embark on this journey you will quickly come to realize that you have stumbled upon the greatest cover-ups in history.

As you become more acquainted with the truth upon your study you will realize two very important things:

- **Leaders, especially scholars, have always been aware of this information and have deliberately chosen to ignore it.**
- **This information has been virtually within the grasp of every American. In many cases it is as close as an encyclopedia or attainable today through the Internet.**

Today, there are over 2.5 billion Christians on the face of the earth – the vast majority who believe in their heart they are true followers of Yeshua, but as I have shown you, are practicing a different religion from which Yeshua practiced. If they all returned to the teachings and life-style taught in Acts, we would see a moral and ethical revolution that would literally rock the foundations of the world and no longer would America, touted to be the most Christian nation in the world, be recognized as the world's most violent and law-breaking nation of the world. That should make you wonder what it would be like if Christians really followed the faith of Yeshua and if your church would really allow you to be like Yeshua.

If you would like more articles and information on topics such as these, please contact us at:

- **Bet Emet Ministries**
- **Pastor Craig Lyons**
- **902 Cardigan**
- **Garland, Texas 75040**



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH & PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT

In order to understand the falsity of much contained in the New Testament to which this web site will address, it is important right up front to become very familiar with the document which espouses beliefs which are totally alien to what the historical Yeshua (Jesus) actually believed and practiced. Only after one has come to terms with the document one accepts for his faith and practice, the New Testament, can then one objectively deal with the questions and problems which follow. Either the document is from God or not. If from God then it must be believed in all parts; but if it can be shown to not be from God but from the traditions of mankind, then objectively questioning where the NT departs from the Old Testament and the faith of Yeshua is not only prudent but necessary.

Along with this comes the problem of the "inspiration" or lack of it as associated with the The New Testament writings. The New Testament and the inspired Apostles are silent on the subject and left the matter to serious doubts and disputations for many centuries: *"There are no indications in the New Testament of a definite new Canon bequeathed by the Apostles to the Church, or of a strong self-witness to Divine inspiration,"* admits the Catholic Encyclopedia (Vol. iii, 274); that is, there is nothing in the 27 booklets which would lead to the suspicion of their "inspiration" or truth. There was then no Church for them to bequeath to, nor was the Canon settled, as we shall see. The Catholic Encyclopedia continues: "It was not until about the middle of the second century that these books were really written and that under the rubric of Scripture the New Testament writings were assimilated to the Old. . . ." But it should be remembered that the inspired character of the New Testament is a Catholic dogma, and must therefore in some way have been revealed to, and taught by, Apostles! (lb. p. 275.)

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that the Catholic encyclopedia just admitted that the bulk of the New Testament writings were written not by the apostles and intimate followers of Jesus but were later written long after their deaths in in the "middle of the second century"? Of course this means "Gentile" authorship and this goes a long way to explain all the inaccuracies concerning Judaism and the Old Testament when mentioned in the New Testament. These Gentile writers were simply not conversant upon Biblical Judaism because they were not Jews!

Further, the dubious and disputed status of the sacred writings through centuries, and the ultimate settlement of the controversies by a numerical majority of the Council of Trent, in 1546 (after the Reformation had forced the issue), is thus admitted:

"The idea of a complete and clear-cut canon of the New Testament existing from the beginning, that is, from Apostolic times, has no foundation in history. The canon of the New Testament, like that of the Old, is the result of a development, of a process at once stimulated by disputes with doubters, both within and without the Church, and retarded by certain obscurities and natural hesitations, and which did not reach its final term until the dogmatic definition of the Tridentine Council. . . . And

this want of an organized distribution, secondarily to the absence of an early fixation of the Canon, left room for variation and doubts which lasted far into the centuries." (Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. iii, 274.) The *modus operandi* of the Holy Council in ultimately "canonizing" Jerome's old Vulgate Version, and its motive for doing so, are thus exposed by the keen pen of the author of The Rise and Fall:

"When the Council of Trent resolved to pronounce sentence on the Canon of Scripture, the opinion which prevailed, after some debate, was to declare the Latin Vulgate authentic and almost infallible; and this sentence, which was guarded by formidable anathemas, secured all the books of the Old and New Testament which composed that ancient version. . . . When the merit of that version was discussed, the majority of the theologians urged, with confidence and success, that it was absolutely necessary to receive the Vulgate as authentic and inspired, unless they wished to abandon the victory to the Lutherans, and the honors of the Church to the Grammarians." (Gibbon, A Vindication, v, 2; Istoria del Consiglio Tridentino, L. ii, p. 147.) A number of these books were bitterly disputed and their authenticity and inspiration denied by the leading Reformers, Luther, Grotius, Calvin, etc., and excluded from their official lists, until finally the Reformed Church followed the example of the Church hopeless of reform and swallowed the canon whole, as we have it today, minus, of course, the Tobit, Judith, and like inspired buffooneries of the True Bible.

Such books and the vicissitudes of their authenticity are thus described: "Like the Old Testament, the New has its deuterio-canonical [i.e. doubted] books and portions of books, their canonicity having formerly been a subject of some controversy in the Church. These are, for entire books: the Epistle to the Hebrews, that of James, the Second and Third of John, Jude, and Apocalypse; giving seven in all as the number of the N. T. contested books. The formerly disputed passages are three:

- the closing section of St. Mark's Gospel, 16:9-20, about the apparitions of Christ after the resurrection;
- the verses in Luke about the bloody sweat of Jesus, 22:43, 44;
- the Pericope Adulterae, or narrative of the woman taken in adultery, St. John, 7:53 to 8:11

Since the Council of Trent it is not permitted for a Catholic to question the inspiration of these passages. (Catholic Encyclopedia, iii, 274.) Besides the forgery of the above and other books as a whole, we shall see many other instances of "interpolated" or forged passages in the Christian books.

"The Gospel has come down to us," says Bishop Irenaeus (about 185 A.D.), "which the apostles did at one time proclaim in public, and, at a later period, by the will of God, handed down to us in the Scriptures, to be the ground and pillar of our faith. . . . For, after our Lord rose from the dead [the apostles] departed to the ends of the earth, preaching the glad tidings of the good things sent from God to us, who indeed do equally and individually possess the Gospel of God." (Iren., Adv. Haer, Bk. III, ch. i; ANF. i, 414.)

You need to set down for this because this will take your breath away. The Second New Testament, in response to Marcion's First New Testament, was given to us by Bishop Irenaeus. Both Bishop Irenaeus and Bishop Papias have both averred that the Christ lived to old age (even at late as 98-117 A.D.), flatly denying thus as "heresy" the Gospel stories as to his crucifixion at about thirty years of age (Wheless, Forgery In Christianity, p. 173). In any event, the Apostles, according to the record, scattered to the ends of the earth, preaching, orally, before they wrote anything at all.

Traditional Christianity and many of our Bibles attest that the New Testament was not written all at once, but the books that compose it appeared one after another in the space of fifty years, i.e., in the second half of the first century. That this last clause is untrue will be fully and readily demonstrated. This statement, too,

contradicts Bishops Papias and Irenaeus, who are, positively, the only two of the **second century** Fathers who up to their times at all mention written Gospels or their supposed authors, as we have seen and shall more particularly notice.

And Catholic Encyclopedia says, as is true, of the earliest existing manuscripts of any New Testament books: "We have New Testament MSS. written not much more than 300 years after the composition of the books"; and it admits (though with much diminution of truth, as we shall see: **"And in them we find numerous differences, though but few of them are important."** (Catholic Encyclopedia xiv, 526.) In this Catholic Encyclopedia at another place, and speaking much more nearly the truth, contradicts itself, saying: *"The existence of numerous and, at times, considerable differences between the four canonical Gospels is a fact which has long been noticed and which all scholars readily admit. . . . Those evangelical records (SS. Matthew, Mark, Luke) whose mutual resemblances are obvious and striking, and . . . the narrative (that of St. John) whose relation with the other three is that of dissimilarity rather than that of likeness."* (Catholic Encyclopedia vi, 658.)

But the so-called "canonical" books of the New Testament are a mess of contradictions and confusions of text, to the present estimate of 150,000 and more "variant readings," as is well known and admitted. Thus Catholic Encyclopedia:

"It is easy to understand how numerous would be the readings of a text transcribed as often as the Bible, and, as only one reading can represent the original, it follows that all the others are necessarily faulty."

Mill estimated the variants of the New Testament at 30,000, and since the discovery of so many MSS. unknown to Mill, this number has greatly increased." (Catholic Encyclopedia iv, 498.)

Answer for yourself: Who, then, is "inspired" to distinguish true from false readings, and thus to know what Jesus Christ and his entourage really said and did, or what some copyist's error or priest's forgery make them say or do, falsely? Well one thing is for certain it surely is not the average Christian who has never studied these issues or read any scholarly books upon the subject. But fortunately not all the follower of Jesus are ignorant of such problems with the New Testament.

Of the chaos and juggling of sacred texts in the Great Dioceses of Africa, Catholic Encyclopedia says: "There never existed in early Christian Africa an official Latin text known to all the Churches, or used by the faithful to the exclusion of all others. The African bishops willingly allowed corrections to be made in a copy of the Sacred Scriptures, or even a reference, when necessary, to the Greek text. With some exceptions, it was the Septuagint text that prevailed, for the Old Testament until the fourth century. In the case of the New, the MSS. were of the Western type. *On this basis there arose a variety of translations and interpretations. . . . Apart from the discrepancies to be found in two quotations from the same text in the works of two different authors, and sometimes of the same author, we now know that of several books of Scripture there were versions wholly independent of each other.*" (Catholic Encyclopedia i, 193.)

Bishop Victor of Tunnunum, who died about 569 A. D. and whose work, says Catholic Encyclopedia, "is of great historical value," says that **in the fifth century**, *"In the consulship of Messala, at the command of the Emperor Anastasius, the Holy Gospels, as written Idiotis Evangelists, are corrected and amended."* (Victor of T., Chronica, p. 89-90; cited by Dr. Mills, Prolegom. to R. V., p. 98.)

Answer for yourself: What does all of this mean to me...the average Christian?

This would indicate some very substantial tinkering with Holy Writ; which process was a continuing one, for, says Catholic Encyclopedia, "Under Sixtus V (1585-90) and Clement VIII (1592-1605) the Latin Vulgate after years of revision attained its present shape." (Catholic Encyclopedia, xii, 769.) And the Vulgate,

which was fiercely denounced as fearfully corrupt, was only given sanction of divinity by the Council of Trent in 1546, under the Curse of God against any who questioned it. Though this amendatory tinkering of their two Holinesses was *after* the Council of Trent had put the final Seal of the Holy Ghost on the Vulgate in 1546!

Let us not forget that as Protestants we have come from such people and their religious persuasions, and that being fact, are faced with the stark realization that we have inherited their religious documents as well.

Answer for yourself: What is the truth about the New Testament that has come down to us today from the Catholic Church...is it truly the Word of God or has it replaced the Word of God and I not know it? It is to these issues we turn in this series on **"What Your Pastor Has Failed To Teach You About The New Testament."**

More to follow.



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #1

For everyone reading this series of articles please understand that I grew up as a fundamentalist Christian. Not only that but I attended Southwestern Theological Seminary in Ft. Worth, Texas, and received a M.Div. degree. Upon completion of my degree I was quickly ordained and began in earnest my Pastoral Career. While in Seminary I encountered what seemed to me a hodgepodge of religious beliefs that seemed more disjointed than in unity. Things just did not add up and contradictions abounded. I constantly wondered how a perfect God allowed or fostered such confusion of religious beliefs; much of which seemed to consistently disagree and contradict what Israel had previously been taught by God and I could not seem to find peace about all this especially in light of the constant reiteration in the Jewish Scriptures that Israel was to be "the" light for all the world concerning the "truth" about YHVH. Prior to Seminary I read a book called Understanding the Difficult Words of Jesus and this book showed me that behind passages which I had heard preached my whole life were Hebraic meanings that I have never heard. Realizing that Jesus is a Jew I quickly saw that unless I understood the passages as Jesus the Jew understood them that I did not have the actual meaning of the passage that God intended I know and understand. I had to find out the Jewish meaning of my faith. All was well until I began to further my studies in related religious studies concerning the above issues. Over the next few years I had my legs cut out from under me as I studied and encountered spiritual truths and facts that often contradicted what I had been led to believe by both the New Testament as well as other religious authority figures. I was shocked to find that what I had been told since a child was not true in many instance; I quickly realized that much of what I had "accepted by faith" was without substance and that many things taught me by my Pastor as a child and even at conservative Baptist Seminary was in error. Understand I was fortunate enough to know some professors well enough in Seminary who confided in me that "all is not as it appears" but they had to hold the "party line" in order to insure that they continued their employment and received their pay checks. But even then they were preparing me for what I would discover on my own in my personal studies into the difficult areas of Christianity and the New Testament which they would not touch in class due to the explosive nature of the subject.

It is a tragic and sad fact that most church-going Christians open their New Testaments and read without ever once considering that they are absorbing the words of a translation from the pens of biased, often politically motivated monks and ministers as transmitted through countless centuries of numerous councils and corrupt church fathers. They are unaware that the New Testament they believe to be "inspired", "infallible", and "inerrant" and which they hold so near and dear contains hundreds of many shocking contradictions and errors when compared line upon line and precept upon precept with the Jewish Scriptures that Jesus used. Understand that a superficial reading of the text once a week will illuminate this sad fact to no one. Only when one undertakes a serious investigation and study of the New Testament will one be able to see the truth about the document he relies upon for his faith and practice in this life. When one sees this for himself one is overwhelmed with the deceptions uncovered. But few ever encounter such truths and facts concerning the New Testament which sheds the light of truth upon it's

many problems. When one undertakes such a comparative study where the Jewish texts are compared with the Christian texts one quickly will see that many dogmas and beliefs in one's Christian religious belief system are in error and often this results in a conduct or behavior is violates what God commanded in the Jewish Scriptures; such erroneous conduct based upon false beliefs is "sin" according to the Jewish Bible and these false beliefs and conducts pass unnoticed by the vast majority of Gentile Christianity....unnoticed that is until we die and meet God face to face and receive our Eternal Condemnation. God calls much of this "sin" and we are not aware because we never "question" what is written in our Christian translations of the Jewish texts as to if God really endorses such. Sadly we never knew there were problems; let me assure you that there are and many of them are critical problems in doctrines and dogmas that just might affect one's eternal salvation such as hidden idolatry that passes for orthodoxy in Gentile Christianity. I am here to tell you that I have questioned such "dogmas" and "doctrines" only because in my studies I ran upon conclusive contradictory evidence and factual data which brought much of the New Testament into question regarding it's validity for faith and practice. Understand both you and I originally took everything in the New Testament "by faith" as being true. It is way past time we investigate whether our faith be sound or if we have built our relationship with God on sinking sand. Again let us understand our faiths as New Testament Christians and followers of Jesus is built off the Christian document; the New Testament. Let me quote a New Testament passage which speaks the truth on the matter:

2 Cor 13:5 Examine yourselves, whether ye be in "the" faith; prove your own selves.

This requires we examine the Christian documents as to their truth as it is responsible for Christians beliefs, dogmas, and doctrines!

In this passage you are told to **"examine"** yourselves....from the Greek:

3985 peirazo (pi-rad'-zo); from 3984; to test (objectively), i.e. endeavor, scrutinize, entice, discipline: assay, examine, go about, prove, try.

The root word is: 3984 peira (pi'-rah); from the base of 4008 (through the idea of piercing); a test, i.e. attempt, experience: assaying, trial.

Understand this is what this series of articles will accomplish. I will put the New Testament on trial as the evidence will be presented to determine if what you have accepted "by faith" is warranted or if you possibly need to reconsider what "you believe" to be true.

Also we are told to **"prove"** to yourself that you be in "the" faith of the early church...from the Greek;

1381 dokimazo-

- **1) to test, to examine, to prove, to scrutinize (to see whether a thing is genuine or not), as metals**
- **2) to recognize as genuine after examination, to approve, to deem worthy**

Understand that just because something is written in the New Testament does not mean it is true. This is a sad fact you will quickly come to realize. This is true even though the information is openly taught in major religious colleges in comparative religion classes and is readily available in most public libraries. But Christians believe that they have no need to look into such things since they are falsely reassured by their clergy that they have "the truth". I wish it were true, but my research over the years has proved such a statement totally false. In reality, it is the Jews who have the truth, have

always had the truth, and will be the nation to lead the world in repentance at the advent of Messiah. The church-going public labors under deception because any damaging information about the bible has been purposely and systematically hidden by a clergy that has no illusions as to how their flocks would react if they knew the truth about "God's infallible word."

As a prime example of this deception fundamentalist Christian ministers are notorious for attacking secular and so-called liberal Christian scholarship, which openly and bluntly publishes the truth about the state of the New Testament. Let me give you an example of such attacks by fundamentalist Christians upon the truth. In A Creationist's Defense of the King James Bible, which was written by the noted fundamentalist Christian educator, Henry M. Morris, he states:

"In any case, one of the serious problems with almost all modern English translations is that they rely heavily on Hebrew and Greek manuscripts of the Bible developed by liberals, rationalists, and evolutionists, none of whom believed in the verbal inspiration of the Bible."

The question I guess I hear the most from my readers is this: "Are we to believe that God would entrust the preservation of His eternal Word to men such as these?" This is nothing more than an assumption; one which fails to take into consideration the free-will of men to defy God and His commandments. As you study with us you will see beyond a shadow of doubt that God does oversee His Word to preserve it; however, it is not the New Testament nor the Christian Old Testament which has been preserved but the Jewish Masoretic Text which is the backbone of the Jewish Bible today (JPS Translation and the Stone Edition Tanakh). For over thousands of years only minute differences appear in these Jewish texts where as the New Testament and the Christian's Old Testament has hundreds of thousands of conflicts and disagreements...many, many of which are in crucial and particular places that affect not only atonement, forgiveness, but Messianic beliefs as well. Simply said the Christian's Bible has been "fixed" long ago and few today know of this tragic adulteration of God's Holy Word! One thing is for certain: the Jewish Scholars and the Jewish people know of it and that is why the vast majority of them cannot accept many things taught about the Messiah in the Christian documents.

IS THERE A PERFECT BIBLE?

What you must understand after reading such a quote above is that Dr. Morris' idea of the perfect bible translation was the King James Version (El Cajon, Ca.: Institute For Creation Research, 1996, p. 5). I know, many of you are thinking "what is so wrong with that"? When you come to the knowledge of the hundreds of corruptions and outright purposeful mistranslations and misquotations in the King James Bible (both OT and NT) which does severe injustice to the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures, you will not longer ask such a question. As you read this series of informative articles you will see that one of the most severe violations of intellectual integrity by the founders of Christianity is shown by their gross distortions of the Old Testament for purposes of indoctrination. In their never-ending quest for religious legitimacy and status, the writers of the New Testament have not hesitated to twist, distort, pervert, and concoct Old Testament verses as expediency dictated. Here the true colors of the creators of Christianity come through in all their radiant splendor. Examples of their dishonest display of propagandistic propensities are abundantly evident to anyone with a reasonably critical eye. You need to know that although it is not my purpose in this series of article to expose individual examples of such errors we at Bet Emet have demonstrated hundreds of such errors in these textual fabrications and purposeful mistranslations for theological advantage in two of our other websites in order for you to see these examples for yourself:

<http://returningtofaithofyeshua.freesevers.com> &

<http://paulproblem.faithweb.com>

Upon your individual and persistent study you will come to see without a doubt an overall scheme of

dishonesty by the writers of the New Testament and the translators of the Jewish Old Testament Scriptures.

Such deceptions and distortions by the writers of the New Testament and the Essene translators of the Jewish Palestinian Masoretic text fall into three broad categories: misquotations, nonquotes, and misinterpretations. A misquotation is defined as deliberately misquoting an Old Testament passage; a nonquote consists of quoting a non-existent Old Testament passage, and a misinterpretation consists of correctly quoting an Old Testament passage while distorting the meaning intended. **In these series of article I plan on dealing primarily with the New Testament and since doing so I plan on showing you that the crafters and writers of the New Testament are guilty on all the counts in hundred of places and only a reasonably critical eye and knowledge of true Jewish Masoretic text, called unfortunately today the "Old" Testament Scripture, is necessary to spot such perversions in the New Testament.** If one is interested in individual examples of such New Testament distortions of the Old Testament and the Jewish Scriptures one needs only to examine not only this webpage but the documentation on this website as well as they contain evidence to prove our point.

But you must see it for yourself. This is the purpose of not only this series of articles but Bet Emet Ministries; to reveal the truth for New Testament believers by exposing the unsoundness of such a document in hopes one will repent of such false beliefs once he sees the truth for himself. Israel is the light of the world and God did not make a mistake in commissioning them to be so and it is high time we as Gentile believers learn our place in the economy of God. **We must always remember that with every lie exposed and repented of one takes a closer step toward the God of Truth.**

Answer for yourself: When one come to the truth behind the New Testament and sees for himself that God never said or gave mankind such dogmas and doctrines as contained in the New Testament, then why follow them?

Let us see what other fundamentalist Christians have to say on the matter. In an article entitled **Modern Bible Versions Are Dangerous-Watch Out For Them!**, the directors of the Fundamental Evangelistic Association of Los Osos, California has this to say about so-called liberal Christian scholarship:

"We must also be aware that the Bible is under attack. Satan, who succeeded in selling the first 'reviled' edition of God's Word to Eve in the Garden of Eden, has surely been busy in this 20th century along the same lines.... It was not until the publication of the Revised Standard Version in 1946 and 1952 that many Fundamentalists became aware of how effectively a new Bible version or translation could be used as a tool of Satan" (**Modern Bible Versions Are Dangerous-Watch Out For Them!** Fundamental Evangelistic Association, Los Osos, California, pp. 1,6).

Having Pastored for years I noticed that many fundamentalist ministers spend almost as much time denouncing so-called liberal scholarship as they do in preaching from "God's infallible word." Their time would be better served looking into what the Liberal Christian scholars have to say. I did. I started out to prove them wrong for after all the New Testament "says this" and "says that". But when I undertook such a task in defense of the New Testament I was quickly presented with evidence and facts which exposed my New Testament as a fraud in many but not all places! Read the last sentence again. I said many but not "all" places. **God desires we have faith in truth and not fables or anti-Semitic lies.** Having seen the evidence then repentance in many of my religious beliefs was the only course for me to take. **Such condemnation by fundamentalist Christians who have not evaluated the evidence for themselves is a tactic which is sadly quite successful in warning Christians away from any damaging information, which in turn ensures the continued financial profitability of the Christian religion.** Understand the basis for much repudiation of "factual truths" by the fundamentalist branch of Christianity. If they were to stand before their flocks and tell them that they were wrong and that their New Testament is flawed in hundreds of places, then they would lose their following and their financial backing. They would have to get a real job and that is beneath most who have lived off the

ignorance of their flocks. Perhaps in fairness it should be said that the blame for such deception cannot be laid fully at the feet of the present-day clergy, because, as we shall now see, many of these men simply do not know these truths for themselves due to their lack of intense study and others are simply carrying on a long Christian tradition which they were never taught to question. Only by the grace of God did I run across materials in my years of study which challenged my Christian beliefs, and taking such challenges I responded to prove myself vindicated in my beliefs. I was overwhelmed at times at the evidence I uncovered which proved my "error laden" New Testament for what it really was.....a combination and mixture of anti-semitic religious lies carried over from pagan mystery religions and gnosticism along with small amounts of Jewish truth. More to follow.



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #2

In what I am about to say now I do not intend to offend anyone. Please understand that. But over the years of my Pastorate I was amazed at the lack of Biblical knowledge by those who called themselves Christians. It seemed to me that rarely I would meet a person who had a workable knowledge of the New Testament let alone the Old Testament which is another story entirely. But they are not totally to blame because the church has centered on preaching instead of teaching since the early fourth century. **This is why Biblical ignorance is rampant in the Christian Church in America today.** If one can quote 10 Scriptures then he considers himself knowledgeable about the Bible. Thus the flock is led around by blind Pastors who themselves are more interested in building bigger ministries than equipping their people to know the truths about their faith. Such truth is dangerous as it liberates mankind from the selfish ambitions of hirelings. If the Christian body of believers knew the truth about their faith then there would be a tumult in Christendom today which would rival the "big bang" of creation.

Answer for yourself: So what is the history of the document Christians call their New Testament?

Answer for yourself: Can the New Testament stand up to critical examination to prove its infallibility, inerrancy, and inspiration?

Answer for yourself: Have you as a New Testament believer ever seriously examined the New Testament to prove to yourself that it is inspired, infallible, and inerrant, and worthy of your commitment to follow its religious tenants?

Answer for yourself: And upon such examination of the New Testament if it be found to be a creation of anti-Semitic dogmas of Rome taken from centuries of syncretistic pagan religious mixture will you repent of such heathen beliefs and return to the faith of the real Yeshua which is not Gentile Christianity, but Biblical Judaism?

These are tough questions only you can answer. But if you ever hope to answer them then you must have the truth about the New Testament. Let us begin our serious inquiry into the infallibility of the New Testament by researching together the History of the New Testament.

THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

After three centuries of obscurity and serious internal conflict, in the fourth century AD a second rate religious cult emerged virtually overnight as the supreme faith of the Roman Empire. This occurred when Emperor Constantine the Great was supposedly converted to Christianity and at once became the benefactor of the church. With this unexpected turn of events, and with the enthusiastic backing of the "first Christian emperor," the surprised Christian Church fathers wasted little time in cementing their new-found authority throughout the empire. Without hesitation they began to centralize all Christian activities through the office of the Bishop of Rome, while at the same time seeking to convert the emperor's subjects to the faith of Christ.

At first the conversion of the pagan masses was undertaken by some inventive methods. One was by Constantine himself offering a bribe (twenty gold coins and a new set of clothes to every new Christian convert), which, needless to say, was initially successful but didn't have a lasting effects (Walker, The Woman's Encyclopedia of Myths and Secrets, p. 174). The better method proved to be the Christian Church's absorption of pagan doctrines, g-ds, g-ddess and customs into their ever-expanding catalogue of theology and tradition. Please understand it is these Godless customs and doctrines which are expounded from the pulpits of American Christianity today. Sadly, for the most part, these congregations are totally unaware of the origins of such Christian dogma as taught by their Pastors because they have never personally studied the origins of such dogmas both preached and contained in the New Testament.

Into the church of the fourth century came the old Persian Mithraic mass, unaltered in many instances to this day. The church absorbed the ancient Vestal Virgins of pagan Rome, who were then called by the new title of nuns. The ancient pagan office of the hierarchy of the mysteries (from which we get the religious term "hierarchy") was transformed into the papacy. The ancient holy day of the sun-g-d, Sunday, or *Dies Solis*, was the replacement for the Jewish Sabbath. The pre-Christian legends of a human virgin giving birth to a halo-bedecked baby savior g-d on December 25, whose life was immediately sought by an evil king while three wise men from the east visited him as he lay in a manger, was given over to Jesus. The pre-Christian legends of a crucified savior-g-d, who died upon a cross for the sins of humanity in the spring only to be resurrected three days later from his tomb, became the legend of Easter. The pre-Christian pagan symbols of bread and wine, eaten by the faithful to represent the body and blood of the sacrificial savior-g-d, entered the church as the Eucharist. Into the church also came hundreds of new Christian saints, transformed from the g-ds and g-ddess—and demons—of the old pagan faiths.

In addition to the better known Christianized pagan g-ds, like St. Nicholas and St. Valentine, here is a small sampling of the numerous g-ds and g-ddesses absorbed by the early Christian Church:

- **ST. FEBRONIA**, who was the original St. Valentine, was derived from the g-ddess Juno Februata; her worship was shared with that of Cupid, the Roman g-d of erotic love, and included a festival of sexual orgies. The g-ddess became the male St. Valentine and Cupid, whose symbols was a winged phallus (penis) was changed to a winged cherub; and the old day of February 14 was retained as the new St. Valentine's Day.
- **ST. SOPHIA** was the same as the g-ddesses Ishtar and Isis; her g-ddess daughters, Faith Hope and Charity became Christian Saints.
- **ST. AGAPE** was the first of the g-ddess Aphrodite's sacred whores, as were St. Chione and St. Irene. **ST. SEBASTIAN** was the Christian version of the Gaulish savior-g-d Bacchus.
- **ST. GEORGE** was originally the pagan savior-g-d Green George, his day, now St. George's Day, was the day of pagan Rome's Feast of Pales, a fertility festival.
- **ST. ALBAN** was the famous English saint who was created from the title of a British g-ddess named Albion. St. Alban was supposedly slain on Holmhurst Hill, where, coincidentally, there was a temple of the g-ddess Albion.
- **ST. DAVID**, the patron saint of Wales, was originally the Welsh sea g-d DEWI, who was Christianized in the 11th century. The old g-d's symbol, the Red Serpent, became the Red Dragon of Wales.
- **ST. AGATHA** was a regional representation of Ishtar offering her breasts, which according to legend, were cut off; the severed breasts, being reinterpreted as bells by the church, is the reason that St. Agatha became the patron of bell founders.
- **ST. DENIS** was originally the g-d of Paris, being their version of the savior-g-d Dionysus.
- **ST. CLARK** was the Celtic g-ddess Sinclair, changed into a Christian Saint.
- **ST. GENEVIEVE** was the Gallic version of Diana, the g-ddess mentioned in the book of Acts.

- **ST. MARGARET** was the Christian version of Aphrodite Marina, or Margarita, Pearl of the Sea, a title later given over to the Virgin Mary.
- **St. CRISPAN** was the pagan tutelary g-d of shoemakers; the old g-d's day, October 25, was adapted as St. Crispin's Day.
- **ST. JANUARIUS**, who had the title of "peter," was the Christian version of the Roman g-d of Gates, who held the keys to the kingdom of heaven; when he was transformed into St. Peter his famous keys became the keys to the gate of the Christian heaven.
- **ST. DEMETRA**, and **ST. DRMETRIUS** are the female and male version of the g-ddess Demeter.
- **ST. URSULA** was the Catholic version of the Saxon g-ddess Ursel.
- **ST. FAITH** was created from the pagan daughters or virtues of the mother g-ddess Sophia; her name in Latin. Bona Fides, means Good Faith, which is a term still in use.
- **St. IGNATIUS**, the pagan "g-d bearer," was a pre-Christian g-d who was brought into the Catholic Church.
- **ST. BACCHUS** bears a name that needs no explanation to anyone slightly versed in pagan mythology.
- **ST. MITHRA**, who was the g-d most responsible for the mysteries being introduced into Christianity.
- **ST. SATUR** and **ST. SWITHIN** who, as princes of shadows, are identified by all mythologist as Satan!
- **ST. CATHERINE** is admitted by Christian scholars as a preposterous creation, because she was nothing more than a continuance of the mother g-ddess of the Fiery Wheel—or Sun—and her worship is still found in India, where she is known as Kathakali.
- **ST. LUCY** is the Christian version of Juno Lucina, Mother of Lights.
- **ST. JOSAPHAT** is the Christian version of the Buddha..
- **ST. CERAUNOS** was originally the thunder-serpent Keraunos.
- **ST. COSMAS** and **ST. DAMANUS** were the Christian versions of the pagan g-ds Castor and Pollux.
- **T. SEBASTIAN** and **ST. HUBERT**, patrons of hunting, were once pagan lords.
- **ST. MERCURY** was a Roman g-d whose temple was Christianized in the sixth century along with himself.
- **ST. ACHILLES** was derived from the g-d Achilles with absolutely no attempt being made by the church to disguise his identity!
- **ST. THECLA**, the "Famous One," was the Ephesian mother g-ddess Diana, whose pagan shrine continued as a Christian place of pilgrimage until the seventeenth century AD.

Keep in mind, these are but a small sampling of the many g-ds, g-ddess, demons, devils and other spirits that were absorbed by the Christian Church in their efforts to convert the world!

NOW LETS THINK

On one hand you have the Jewish people with their religion and customs which is strange and alien from all other nations of the world. One only need to remember the book of Esther at the hatred for the Jews by the non-Jews of the world. And it is into this world that Paul and others are taking this "Jewish Gospel" along with the writings of the New Testament in hope of "conversion" of the masses to the faith of Christ.

Answer for yourself: If you understand the scenario I just pictured for you then does it not seem to you, at first glance, remarkable with what readiness the non-Jewish cultures of the world dropped their ancestral faiths and accepted Christianity through the persuasions of Christian missionaries?

Answer for yourself: What can explain the openness and readiness of these non-Jewish nations to receive this "Jewish Gospel" as taught by Paul and as recorded by the writers of the New Testament as the documents

circulated among the congregations?

THE TESTIMONY OF THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS

The information is massive so I have just chosen a few examples to show why early Christian Doctrine along with their writings (the New Testament) was so readily accepted among the pagans to whom they evangelized. Remember that behind all of this is our question regarding the "truthfulness" of the New Testament as a Revelation from God and not one copied by men from prior pagan sources. Now on with the testimony of the Early Church Fathers:

1. The Holy Father Minucius Felix, in his Octavius, written as late as A.D. 211

In this writing Father Felix indignantly resents the supposition that the sign of the cross should be considered as exclusively a Christian symbol; and represents his advocate of the Christian arguments as retorting on an infidel opponent thus: *"As for the adoration of crosses, which you object to against us, I must tell you that we neither adore crosses nor desire them. You it is, ye Pagans, who worship wooden g-ds, who are the most likely people to adore wooden crosses, as being parts of the same substance with you deities. For what else are your ensigns, flags, and standards, but crosses? Your victorious trophies not only represent a simple cross, but a cross with a man upon it"*.

2. Tertullian, a Christian Father of the second and third centuries, writing to the Pagans says:

"The origin of your g-ds is derived from figures molded on a cross. All those rows of images on your standards are the appendages of crosses; those hanging on your standards and banners are robes of crosses" (Egyptian Belief, p. 217).

3. Justin Martyr, in his Dialogue with Trypho, says:

"That there exist not a people, civilized or semi-civilized, who have not offered up prayers in the name of a crucified Savior to the Father and Creator of all things".

Also Justin remarks: *"It having reached the Devil's ears that the prophets had foretold that Christ would come...he [the Devil] set the heathen poets to bring forward a great many who should be called sons of Jove [that is, the sons of God]; the Devil, laying his schemes in this to get men to imagine that the true history of Christ was of the same character as the prodigious fables and poetic stories"*. (Justin, Apol. 2.). We must understand properly the above quote. In the attacks upon Christianity by heathenism Christians were blamed from "copying" the pagan' religious beliefs and the only answer that the leading apologist for this new "Gentile Christian faith" could come up is that "the Devil" did it!

4. Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian, says:

"that the names of Jesus and Christ were both known and honored among the ancients (Eccl. Hist., Lib. 1. Chap. iv.)

Also Eusebius states: *"that which is called the Christian religion is neither new nor strange, but if it be lawful to testify the truth, well known to the ancients"*. (Eccl. History, lib. 2, ch. v).

5. Gregory of Nazianzus, writing to Saint Jerome, says:

"A little jargon is all that is necessary to impose on the people. The less they comprehend the more they admire. Our forefathers and doctors have often said, not what they thought, but what circumstances and necessity dictated". (Heiron ad. Nep. Quoted in Volney's Ruins, p. 177, note. Boston: 1872).

6. Isaac de Casaubon, the great ecclesiastical scholar, says:

"It mightily affects me to see how many there were in the earliest times of the Church, who considered it as a capital exploit to lend to heavenly truth the help of their own inventions, in order that the new doctrine might be more readily received by the wise among the Gentiles. These officious lies, they were wont to say, were devised for a good end". (Quoted in Taylor's Diegesis, p. 44).

7. M. Turretin, the learned Christian advocate, says in describing Christianity in the fourth century, when the Canon of the New Testament was established says:

"That it was not so much the empire that was brought over to the faith, as the faith that was brought over to the empire; not the Pagans who were converted to Christianity, but Christianity that was converted to Paganism". (Taylor, Diegesis, p. 50).

8. Saint Augustine says:

"That in our times is the Christian Religion, which to know and follow is the most sure and certain health, called according to that name, but not according to the thing itself, of which it is the name; for the thing itself which is now called the Christian Religion really was known to the ancients, nor was wanting at any time from the beginning of the human race until the time when Christ came in the flesh, from whence the true religion, which had previously existed, began to be called 'Christian; and this in our day is the Christian religion; not as having been wanting in former times, but as having in later times received this name". (Opera Augustini, vol. i. p. 12, quoted in Taylor's Diegesis, p. 42).

9. Paul

Paul pleads with his listeners that he was made a minister of the gospel, which had been preached to every creature under Heaven (Col. 1:23). You must think now! In saying this Paul was indicating that the doctrines he was bringing the Gentile world were already known by the peoples he targeted for "conversion". We find Saint Paul, the first Apostle of the Gentiles, avowing that he was made a minister of the Gospel which had already been preached to every creature under Heaven, and preaching a *God manifest in the flesh, who had been believed on in the world, long before the commencement of his ministry*, and who could not have been Jesus of Nazareth, who had certainly not been preached at that time, nor generally believed on in the world till ages after. Paul was preaching to the Gentiles a Jewish adaptation of their own prior pagan superstitions and religion. The reason for such compromise by Paul is not difficult to fathom once comes to the truth about Paul but let me warn you the "half" has not been told about the truth concerning this Paul. You need to know but it is not pretty when you find the facts about him both hidden in places in the NT as well as documents that exist outside the Bible that expose him for what he really was. We can read Luke's accounts of Paul but let us never forget that Luke was his friend and friends tend to bias their depiction of other friends. The truth about Paul can be found at this website: <http://paulproblem.faithweb.com>.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice the testimony of early Church fathers testify to the fact that the Christian religion is not new or a Divine Truth which dropped down from heaven, but the same religion of the ancients only retold with different names for their g-ds and saints?

Answer for yourself: Then if the above claim and charge be true, then are we not to expect that in the writings of the New Testament to find such pre-existing doctrines carried over from pagan mystery religions?

Answer for yourself: After seeing the New Testament as a mixture of conflicting doctrines and dogmas, many of which come directly from pagan mystery religions, what is to be your response before God?

Answer for yourself: Once you see for yourself that these non-Jews who wrote and continually altered the New Testament did no more than lend to heavenly truth the help of their own inventions, in order that the new doctrine might be more readily received by the wise among the Gentiles by offering them no more than what they already had only dressed up in new names (Jesus), can you now better see the ease of conversion of the polytheistic non-Jews, and what will be your approach to the New Testament which can no longer be shown to be the citadel of truth?

But a more complete study of the subject only reveals more concerning the unusual ease of this conversion much less surprising, by making it apparent that the Christian Church's Gentile missionaries:

1. Added the leading dogmas of Biblical faith to their own existing pagan faiths rather than replacing all their pagan beliefs by Biblical Jewish beliefs
2. Caused in time the cessation of the masses to worship their pagan g-ds but transferred such pagan concepts from such g-ds to Yeshua, the Virgin, and saints
3. Invested Yeshua, the Virgin, and saints with the attributes of their pagan g-ds and recorded such in the New Testament as if inspired by God
4. Retained most of their old religious dogmas and ceremonies and passed them off to the unsuspecting as if God inspired

With the absorption of the old pagan faiths and the recording of them in the "infallible and inerrant document called the New Testament", mass conversions became a reality. Think about it for a minutes. The pagans to whom the Gentile Gospel would come would not have to give up anything at all in accepting this Pauline Yeshua. The same concepts and beliefs held by them about their pagan g-ds and g-ddesses were only transferred and made applicable to Yeshua, the Virgin, and saints as well. The conversion of the non-Jewish world in the earliest centuries was accomplished easily by only changing the names of their g-ds; the concepts staid the same. And few know the truth about the alteration of the religion of Yeshua which went into all the world and accept today unquestioningly that what they have as taught by Christianity is what God intended they have. Nothing could be further from the truth and God is not amused as the apostasy of the people of God today. Not only that, but neither could He be pleased with the apathy and lethargy inherent in most believes who fail to study to discover these truths for themselves before they die.

Understand in closing, it was these early writers and redactors of the New Testament manuscripts who "wrote into the oral traditions of a Jewish Rabbi named Yeshua" pre-existing accounts of their pagan g-ds and molded such stories in and around the life of Yeshua. Therefore, without a through background in comparative religion one is helpless in reading the New Testament because he lacks the knowledge and skill necessary to separate out truth from fiction. Now, on with the next study.
Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #3

With the absorption of the old pagan faiths within the texture of Christianity in the latter first and early second century, it was then that a secure Christian hierarchy began an intensive campaign to outlaw rival pagan religions. However, in a move to placate the remaining pagans and win them over to Christianity, the hierarchy often rededicated pagan temples and shrines, which essentially allowed former pagans to continue their worship virtually uninterrupted. This is why one can still find pre-Christian pagan idols of a mother-g-d-dess holding her infant savior-son still surviving in a number of Christian churches—the only exception being that they now have the Christian names of Mary and Jesus.

CHRISTIANITY'S OWN TESTIMONY CONVICTS THEMSELVES

The Christian Church cannot escape the origins of their services, as The Catholic Encyclopedia bluntly admits: *"In this age of Pan-Babylonianism it is not at all surprising that the germinal ideas of the Christian Communion should be located in Babylon, where in the Adapa myth mention has been found of 'wafer of life' and 'food of life.'"* (Volume X, p. 12.) The editors of this article go on to quote the famous religious historian Franz Cumont's Mysterien des Mithra, in which he documents the origin of the Mass to the Roman sun-g-d Mithra. They also note that even the ancient Catholic historian Tertullian was so angry when he found the tremendous similarities of Catholicism to Mithraism that he *"... ascribed this mimicking of Christian rites to the 'devil.'"* (Ibid., p. 13.)

Few know but Tertullian, an early Church Father, often questioned the legitimacy of his own faith. One should only ask himself: "What did Tertullian find that so upset him?" I want you to pay particular attention to his reply. *"The origin of your g-ds is derived from figures molded on a cross. All those rows of images on your standards are the appendages of crosses; those hanging on your standards and banners are robes of crosses"* (Egyptian Belief, p. 217).

The priests of Mithraism celebrated Mass by using holy water, bells, candles, and offered communion on Sunday, which all took place in one of their elaborate idol-bedecked cathedrals. (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed. 1938, Volume 15, p. 621.) Another example is found in ancient Tibet and Nepal, where the worship of their crucified savior-g-d was found to be very close to the Christian Jesus. *"In Tibet was found the pope, or head of the religion, whom they called the 'Dalai Lama,' they use holy water, they celebrate a sacrifice with bread and wine; they give extreme unction, pray for the sick; they have monasteries, and convents for women; they chant in their service, have fasts; they worship one g-d in a trinity, believe in a hell, heaven, and a half-way place or purgatory; they make prayers and sacrifices for the dead, have confession, adore the cross; have...strings of beads to count their prayers..."* Doane, Bible Myths, p. 400.)

Historian Arthur Wigall writes that, *"When Christian saints triumphed, these paintings and figures became those of Madonna and child without any break in continuity: No archaeologist, in fact, can now tell whether some of these objects represent the one or the other"* (Wigall, The Paganism In Our Christianity, p. 129). E.J. Waggoner comments that when Christianity prevailed over paganism, *"It worshipped in the same temples; it performed, to a certain extent, the same rites; it actually abrogated the local worship of one of the multitudinous deities of paganism"*. Noted mythologist S.C. Wake writes: *"The 'Black Virgins' of the French cathedrals prove, when examined critically, to be basalt figures of the g-ddess Isis. The Virgin Mary succeeded to her form, titles, symbols, rites, and ceremonies . . . It is astonishing how much of the Egyptian and the second-hand Indian symbolism passed over into the usages of the following times. The high cap and hooked staff of the g-d became the bishop's miter and crosier"* (Westropp, Hodder M., Wake Staniland C. Ancient Symbol Worship, Influence of the Phallic Idea in the Religions of Antiquity, p. 97).

"It is well known that when paganism was superseded by Christianity, the older religion was by no means obliterated", writes George H McKnight in his book, St. Nicholas. He continues: *"In Greece the pagan temples often were converted into Christian churches. At Athens, the Parthenon, a temple of the Virgin Pallas, became a church of the Virgin Mary, the temple of Theseus [Zeus] became a church devoted to . . . St. George . . . In many of the churches of Rome may be seen beautiful classical columns taken from the earlier pagan structures."* He notes that at Syracuse in Sicily, one can find that *" . . . the older classical temple of Minerva has been transformed into a renaissance cathedral [the church was renamed, appropriately, Santa Maria Sopra Minerva, or Holy Mary over the shrine of Minerva]"* (Westropp, Hodder M., Wake Staniland C. Ancient Symbol Worship, Influence of the Phallic Idea in the Religions of Antiquity, p. 125).

A pagan temple in Rome, sacred to the "Bona Dea" (the good g-ddess), was rededicated to the Virgin Mary. Another temple sacred to Apollo was demolished and rebuilt—using the materials from the older temple—in honor of St. Apollinaris. The temple of Mars is now the church of St. Martine, and the temple holy to Caelestis Dea, or the heavenly g-ddess, was converted into a Catholic church at Carthage. What is interesting in this instance is that the last pagan high priest of this temple, whose name was Aurelius, disappeared from history (in AD 390) at exactly the same time a new Christian Bishop of Carthage appears—whose name, coincidentally, was also Aurelius.

Answer for yourself: Did you catch that?

The church of St. Reparatae in Florence was originally dedicated to the great g-ddess Nutria. The church of St. Stephen in Bologna was built from the temple of Isis. In Rome, the temple dedicated to the g-d Romulus was made over to a St. Theodore. Quite revealing is that the old custom of women bringing their sick children to the temple to be healed by the pagan g-d Romulus continues to this day, the only difference being that the present-day faithful now evoke the name of St. Theodore (Doane, Bible Myths, pp. 396-397).

The Church of Santa Maria Maggiore in Rome was built over the sacred cave of the Magna Mater. The Church of St. Clemente in Rome has beneath its altar a vault where there is a beautifully carved shrine and altar to the sun-g-d Mithras. Atop the altar is the sun-g-d wearing his radiant crown. The temple of the Roman mother-g-ddess, complete with the g-d Mithra's phallus standing on top, once stood on the site of the present Vatican. Actually it is still there buried under the artificial hill that was constructed to form the court of St. Peter's." And the memory of the ancient mother g-ddess accounts for the name of St. Mary's Rotunda, which is so important to the Vatican complex.

In addition to the rededication of the great pagan temples, throughout Europe and the British isles local parish churches are usually built on the tops of hills where a former pagan holy site was once located. This is why many of the old phallic stones of the pre-Christian religion can still be found

standing in the church yards of the present Christian churches.

At any rate, such is the history of Christian tradition. But all these changes were simply a prelude to accomplishing the overall objective of enforcing Christianity on the whole of the Roman Empire. Understand such a plan was carried out by merging Jewish beliefs with prior pagan beliefs. Such a mixture assured acceptance by the non-Jews by bringing to them another g-d fashioned already in the image of those that they already revered.

Answer for yourself: To a polytheist what is another g-d? These amalgamation of beliefs were first fashioned in oral traditions and later recorded in a document called the New Testament. You have already read the testimony of early Church Fathers to the guilt of the Church in doing such. Now comes the next step in Rome's overall plan... the destruction of as much as possible existing documents which exposed their religious duplicity.

The next and most important step involved a centuries-long campaign of horrendous destruction of anything which revealed the plagiarism by the Catholic Christian Church which took the majority of its "dogmas and doctrines" from prior pagan mystery religions to which they and their "missionary targets" were already familiar. Only in this way would they be able later to hold sway over the masses and none would have "proof" any longer of the Church's copy-cat "theology". This would ensure that Rome could not only claim a "Divine Revelation" since all proof of their plagiarism of pagan mystery religions would be destroyed, but they could then continue without fear of exposure teaching pagan lies and myths as "Divine Truths" which were intended to secure the allegiance and finances of the masses who would depend on such religious establishments for their very "salvation" for soon the Catholic Church would teach that there "was no salvation outside the Catholic Church and its doctrines". Is was only a short step from teaching such pagan lies and myths to recording these pagan myths in a "Divine Document" latter called the New Testament. Without previous references to their dishonesty, the path was cleared for global conversion, for if you remember, they were taking the same stories and myths and only changing the name of the characters. And we read the New Testament most of our lives as if it were "inspired, infallible, and inerrant" never once knowing that most of the accounts in the New Testament had been told before for thousands of years by the people the God of the Old Testament would tell Israel to stay apart from and to whose religion they were not to adopt!

Answer for yourself: What impact would it have if it could be shown that the core teachings of Christianity, a religion espoused as given by God from Heaven, were nothing more than the retelling of pagan mythology as applied to a Jewish Rabbi named Yeshua.

More to follow.



20%^{off} on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: NF20



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #4

Read any good books lately? **Well I can assure you that your Church does not want you to read certain books because if you do then you will become aware of the deceptions within the New Testament of which I continually speak.**

As many men and governments before and after the time of the fourth century had learned, if a dictatorship is to control an entire people it is essential to first control education. In other words, to be successful a dictatorship needs to maintain a murderous grip over what their people hear, read and think. Just look at the Communist dictatorship of the former Soviet Union for your example in your own life time. But you don't need to look just at the Soviet Union; lets look closer to home beginning with the Christian Church of the earliest centuries who controlled knowledge. Following a proven method, the main objective of the Roman Empire's new Christian dictatorship beginning with Constantine became the destruction of books and a monopoly on education.

Calling it a "service to God," Christianity's venerable church fathers caused an unfathomable amount of historical materials to be forever lost to the world, such as the entire contents of the ancient Palatine Apollo Library which were burned on the orders of Pope Gregory the Great (AD 540-604). His decree stated that the library was to be burned "*lest its secular literature distract the faithful from the contemplation of heaven*" (Smith, *Man and His Gods*, pp. 228, 253). **Knowing that the library contained thousands of scrolls from the pre-Christian mystery religions—whose doctrines and customs had been recently absorbed by the Christian Church—Pope Gregory might just have well said "lest its secular literature expose the origin of the Christian Church!" This was the real reason why anything remotely connected to the old pagan religions was savagely attacked by the church! The whole of Roman authority as well as Christian Imperial influence would be severely damaged if it was shown that the core teachings of Christianity, a religion espoused as given by God from Heaven, could be shown to be nothing more than the retelling of pagan mythology as applied to a Jewish Rabbi named Yeshua. Such damaging documents exposing Christian Roman religious lies passed off as Divine Truth as well as their document, the New Testament, had to be destroyed whenever found in order to preserve and protect the Church-State of the Roman Empire. Failure to censor the truth when found could only lead to the enlightenment of the people whereby Rome could no longer use fear and ignorance to control the masses through religion. Rome you must remember saw too it that there was "no salvation" outside the Bishop of the Roman Church; thus it was easy to see how Rome used ignorance of the truth and fear of the loss of one's salvation to control the masses to do the bidding of the Roman Church-State which could be seen in her political and financial desires to propagate herself. If the masses were to learn that salvation as taught by Rome was only pagan ideas recast through a Jewish Rabbi and that their salvation was in doubt, then rebellion to such a religious and political hierarchy would be the guaranteed outcome. All evidence revealing Rome's religious duplicity had to be destroyed whenever and wherever it was encountered.**

ROME DESTROYS THE EVIDENCE TO THEIR RELIGIOUS LIES... AND IS THE MORTAL ENEMY TO KNOWLEDGE

Every book in the Gnostic Basilides, Porphyry's thirty-six volumes and an additional 27,000 papyrus rolls of the Gentile mystery religions were all burned by order of the church. Concerning the great ancient library of Alexandria, built by Ptolemy, Joseph Wheless writes: *"This Library became the most extensive and celebrated of the ancient world, containing some 700,000 manuscript books at the time it was savagely destroyed, in 391 AD, by the benighted Christian zeal and fury of Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria and his crazy monks of Nitria, as related in Kingsley's Hypatia or any history of the times"* (Wheless, Forgery in Christianity, p. 58) These events are simply summed up by Edward Carpenter, who writes, that *"the Christians took special pains to destroy the pagan records and so obliterate the evidence of their own dishonesty"* (Graham, Deceptions and Myths of the Bible, p. 444).

The official Christian zeal for the destruction of books continued unquenched over the coming centuries. For instance, when the Spanish invaders arrived in South America one of the first acts of the accompanying priests was to order the mass destruction of the ancient libraries of the Aztecs. This action became imperative when the priests discovered that the natives had a pagan religion that virtually mirrored their own. With native religious customs like a virgin-loom crucified savior g-d, a Eucharist, a clergy that essentially consisted of a pope, priests and virgin nuns, and adoring a golden cross as the symbol of their salvation on which their savior g-d was crucified, the Catholic priests had ample reason to be zealous in their actions.

The above example is startling when you think about it. These Catholic missionaries travel half-way around the world and these "ignorant" natives have the same religion that they had in Catholic Europe?

Answer for yourself: How is that possible?

Well the answer is not hard but it is involved and a complete understanding of how the residue of "sun worship" became worldwide will explain a lot; not the least of it the ministry and later success of Paul in the New Testament among the Gentiles. Again I warn you that this information is not pretty but very unsettling but necessary if the New Testament believer truly desires to know and return to "the faith" once given to the saints. I have devoted one entire website to this problem of how the faith and religion of Yeshua, a Jew, was paganized and passed off as just another modification of prior sun-worship and you can see how it was done in detail and the doctrines taken from it as found in the New Testament by visiting this website: <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>.

The ancient Indians of South America worshipped a trinity of g-ds, the chief g-d, or father, being Icona. His son, called Bacob, was born of a virgin mother, named Chibirias, who dwelled in heaven with the holy spirit. The son, Bacob, born of a virgin, came to earth as a human and was tied or nailed to a cross, where he both died for the sins of humanity and the fertility of the earth, after which he was raised back to life (Yucatec Trinity in South America quoted in The Mythology of All Races, Volume XI, p. 143. See also, Hislop, The Two Babylons, pp. 18-19.). T.W. Doane writes: *"Sometimes Quetzalcoatl or Bacob is represented as tied to the cross and at other times he is represented in attitude of a person crucified, with impressions of nail holes in his hands and feet..."* (op. cit., p. 200.) These native pagan crosses corresponded, as T.W. Doane writes, *"in every particular with those delineated on Babylonian monuments;"* but it was also distinguished by the Catholic designation, *"the tree of subsistence", "the wood of health", "the emblem of life,"* etc. (op. cit., p. 347.)

In his renowned histories of South America, James Prescott relates how the Spanish missionaries, when they first arrived in Mexico, *". . . could not suppress their wonder as they beheld the cross, the sacred*

emblem of their own faith, raised as an object of worship in the temples . . . [they] were not aware that the cross was the symbol of worship of the highest antiquity in Egypt and Syria; and that rite, resembling those of communion and baptism, were practiced by pagan nations on whom the light of Christianity had never shone." (Prescott, History of the Conquest of Mexico, Volume 111, pp. 368, 371.) In fact, the Christian priests found in Palenque, Mexico a heathen temple known as the **"Temple of the Cross."** This temple, almost 3,000 years old, preserved a cross that is identical to the modern form now being used in the Catholic Church. With such discoveries the priest at first thought that the land had been reached by other Christian missionaries, yet when they finally understood the antiquity of the native religion they were confused as to why legends and symbols so close to their own Catholicism should be found there (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume X, p. 252.). Traveling into what would one day become Vera Cruz, Mexico, they found a marble cross, identical to their own sacred symbol, topped with a crown of gold. The natives told the astonished priests that **"one more glorious than the SUN died upon the cross!"** (Murray-Ayosley, Symbolism of the East and West, p 70.)

Answer for yourself: Did you notice the above author described the crucifixion as the "sun" and not the "son" that dies upon the cross? **This is just the beginning of how sun-worship is tied to the story of Jesus in the Gentile's New Testament!**

These Catholic priests would soon find themselves even more confused, as Prescott notes: **"Their surprise was heightened, when they witnessed a religious rite which reminded them of Christian Communion." The communion in the form of the Aztec sun-g-d deity ". . . was made of the flour of maize, mixed with blood, and after consecration by the priest, was distributed among the people, who, as they ate it, "showed signs of humiliation and sorrow, declaring it was the flesh of the deity."** (Prescott, History of the Conquest of Mexico, Volume 111, p.369.)

SINCE THE CHURCH WON'T ADMIT THE TRUTH...THAT THEIR DOCTRINES ARE COPIES OF PAGANISM...WHAT DOES SHE DO?

Don DeSolis, a Catholic writer in the eighteenth century, tries to explain these obvious "Christian" counterparts within the pagan customs of South America: **" . . . it seems that the Devil . . . was ambitious to imitate Baptism . . . and even the Sacraments of the Catholic Church, since he introduced among the Barbarians the Confession of Sins . . . and Communion which the priest administered on certain days. They had likewise Jubilees, processions, offerings of incense and other forms of divine worship; Nay, they even gave their Chief Priest the title of Pope in their language:" "Satan, . . . whether with a design to abuse and profane the Sacred Mysteries and Ceremonies by mingling them with his Abominations, is still aspiring to imitate the Most High."** (De Solis, The History of the Conquest of Mexico, Volume 1, p. 355-6.)

We can add to these examples that of the Christian Crusaders who destroyed every book and scroll they could find when they entered the so-called holy land. You may not be aware of this but this action was, in fact, one of the main objectives of the Crusades. But with all this destruction there was still another outstanding problem—the bible itself, especially the New Testament, the contents of which are most revealing to the critical eye.

Answer for yourself: The church could destroy all existing extra-Biblical pagan mystery religious documents which reveals the plagiarized New Testament, but what were they to do about the New Testament itself, since knowledgeable people who would possibly read it could recognize such copying of pagan myths as passed-off Roman "Divine truths"?

THE CREATION OF AN IGNORANT CHURCH TO PROTECT ROME'S SECRET

Remember that there is nothing new under the sun says Solomon. The problem of an informed church was so damaging and obvious that Pope Gregory, who had denounced *"all secular education as folly"* and who had burned a few hundred tons of pre-Christian scrolls to erase the past and protect Rome's plagiarism of pagan myths, **finally commanded that the common people should not read the bible** (Graham, *Deceptions and Myths of the Bible*, p. 444). This command meant that the ordinary Christian man and woman could only hear selected bits and pieces of the bible as interpreted by their priests in his Sunday sermon. The Catholic Christian Church was spared embarrassment and ensured their continued domination of the people who would never know different or the facts behind the New Testament. **Finances would continue to be collected forever to ensure the longevity of the Church-State as long as the people never learned the truths behind the dogmas and doctrines Rome borrowed from their pagan past and included in their "infallible" New Testament. It also meant that the "protectors of the faith of Christ" could keep their holy book from close scrutiny and critical assessment. The paganism of the New Testament they hoped could never be found out by the masses. The Catholic Church had destroyed almost all existing pagan religious documents which mimicked the New Testament in religious concepts and ideas and now they had limited the people from ever reading it. They were safe they thought and their positions of influence safe-guarded. The people were to be kept in the "dark" concerning the truth and the Dark Ages were about to begin. Ignorance was bliss to the leaders of the Catholic Church.**

Answer for yourself: Today one might wonder "why didn't the average Christian protest the pope's command"?

The answer lies in the absolute control the church wielded over both king and commoner, which perhaps is easily demonstrated in the title of the powerful and notorious pope, Innocent III (1198-1216). In 1198 he was crowned "FATHER OF PRINCES AND KINGS, RULER OF THE WORLD, VICAR OF CHRIST and G-D". DeRosa says that this pontiff "...never doubted this blasphemy was his due" (DeRosa, *Vicars of Christ*, p. 67). Innocent, whose name is a historical joke because he is credited as the father of the infamous "holy" Inquisition, added to his power by claiming that "All things on earth and in *heaven* and in *hell* are subject to the Vicar of Christ" (Halley, *Halley's Bible Handbook*, p. 776). Innocent's g-d-like attitude was bequeathed to his successors, an example being Pope Leo XIII (1878-1903) who openly declared that, "We hold upon this earth the place of God Almighty" (Leo XIII, *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*, 3rd ed. P. 304, extracted from *The Reunion of Christendom*, 20 June, 1894).

In the coming centuries Pope Gregory's orders against bible reading were backed by the threat of death: "In 1234, the Synod of Taragona declared that anyone was a heretic, who, having in his possession a copy of the Scriptures in the vernacular [i.e., in their own language], refused to surrender it to be burned within eighty days" (Barrett, *While Peter Sleeps*, p. 223). In other words, after 1234 A.D. anyone possessing a bible that he or she could read was guilty of heresy, and the fate of an unrepentant heretic, after the initial routine torture sessions, was being burned alive.

The prohibition against bible reading was further assured by the fact that the Christian Church had essentially eliminated education in the Holy Roman Empire. By the Middle Ages ninety-nine percent of all Europeans couldn't read or write—a number that usually included most ruling kings and princes. For those few who could read, the study of any subject that might call into question the "truth" of the bible was a perilous undertaking, the most dangerous being a study of the sciences.

Even though the ancient scientist Eratosthenes of Alexandria had measured the circumference of the earth in the third century BC, and his colleague Hipparchus invented longitude and latitude in the second century BC, and even though the ancient Phoenicians had sailed and explored most of the world a thousand years before the

time of Jesus—establishing colonies as far away as South America—the Christian Church declared that the earth was flat. It was an "infallible" declaration went unopposed because the church controlled all avenues that might call into question their brand of scientific" reasoning—this and the fact that they had already burned every book of science in existence, including those of the ancient scientists Democritus and Leucippus, who taught the atomic theory of matter in the fifth century BC, and all of the books of the ancient mathematician and geographer Eratosthenes of Alexandria (Eratosthenes of Alexandria; The Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th ed., Vol. 13, p. 526).

In contrast, and at the time most Christian kings and princes in Europe couldn't read or write, a Moorish king had a library of 600,000 books available to his subjects. The Moorish city of Cordova, Spain had eight hundred public schools, while only one percent of Europe was literate. Religious historian Lloyd Graham writes: "It was difficult to encounter even a Moorish peasant who could not read and write.... In Christian Europe scholars were burned at the stake; in Moorish Europe they were the highest paid men in the realm. One Moorish king gave his leading scholar forty thousand pieces of gold each year, while in Christendom, Roger Bacon, credited with inventing the camera, clock, telescope and lens, gunpowder and steam power, was imprisoned fourteen years as a sorcerer and heretic" (Graham, Deceptions and Myths of The Bible, pp. 457-458). True to their own stated objectives, once the Spanish had driven the Moors out of Europe a hateful Cardinal Ximenes "delivered to the flames in the square of Granada eighty thousand Arabic manuscripts" to be burned " (Graham, Deceptions and Myths of The Bible, pp. 444).

Indeed, the church's hatred of science was so intense that its hierarchy even went so far as to bring charges against Pope Sylvester II. Desiring something more than a religious education, and because there were no universities in Christian Europe that taught anything other than theology, Sylvester, when he was a cardinal, went to a Moorish university in Spain and received an education in medicine. It was putting this education to practical use that ran him afoul of the church hierarchy. After being accused of sorcery, historians note that it was only because of his high office that Pope Sylvester escaped prosecution and the horrors of the Inquisition.

Such an attitude towards the sciences meant that the Christian Church can be held directly responsible for catastrophes like the so-called Black Death, the bubonic plague of the Middle Ages that killed between one-third to one-half of Europe's population.

Now I want you to pay attention to the next quote from a rather well respected church father: Augustine. Remember when you read this quote that many of your Christian Doctrines today are directly attributable to this man. Now after reading the quote think to yourself if you should follow any reasoning coming from such a man and how much of your Christianity today is absolute foolishness. During this deadly sickness of Europe, called the Black Death, the church still agreed with the "wisdom" of its venerated St. Augustine, who declared: *"All diseases of Christians are to be ascribed to demons; chiefly do they torment first-baptized Christians, yea, even the guileless newborn infant"* (Graham, Deceptions and Myths of The Bible, pp. 458).

At the same time the church was torturing and burning scientists as heretics, one of their most often recommended remedies for illness was driving out the offending demon by the use of "holy water" or by touching a "blessed" relic, which is to say by touching the bones of a saint, or vials of Jesus' blood, pieces of the "true Cross" or, in one instance, a piece of the wing of the archangel Gabriel, which, the church said, he left behind when he came to tell the virgin Mary that she was with child. **All of these so-called cures were, of course, for sale from the Christian church.**

Throughout Christendom local churches offered cures for just about any type of ailment, all effected by their own local relics. Any "holy" relic dipped into well water, could, as the church advertised far and wide, cure tumors, baldness, impotence, infertility, bad teeth, heart, liver and stomach ailments, broken bones, difficult pregnancies, sores, lepers . . . !

The selling or use of holy bones (or relics) became so profitable that a special papal corporation was founded in Rome to discover, sell, and transport, holy relics to all parts of Europe. The greed became so great that Joe

Nickell, in his book, Inquest on The Shroud of Turin, writes: *"The living bodies of likely future saints were covetously watched by relic mongers; when Thomas Aquinas fell ill and died at a French monastery, his body was decapitated and his flesh boiled away by monks greedy for his bones. It is said that St. Romnald of Ravenna heard during a visit to France that he was in mortal peril because of the value of his bones and fled homeward . . ."* (p. 51.) *"Rome, says Gregorovius, was like a moldering cemetery in which hyenas howled and fought as they dug greedily alter corpses."* (Woodrow, Babylon Mystery Religion, p. 54.)

One of the most famous examples of relic profiteering is that of Saint Nicholas. He is supposedly buried in the city of Bari, Italy, where his remains were brought after being supposedly discovered by some merchants in Myra. According to the story when these merchants found St. Nicholas' body it was flowing in holy oil, and after his re-burial in Bari this "holy oil" miraculously continued to exude from his bones. Claiming that the oil had miraculous healing powers, the monks began one of the biggest money making schemes in the history of the Italian Church. Unless there were a failure in the local olive oil crop, this "holy" oil was sold by the Christian clergy of Bari, gallon after gallon, century after century to the ill and dying. (McKnight, St Nicholas, p. 147. See also, Walsh, The Story of Santa Klaus, pp 45-46).

Notably the superstition of relics as means of magical cures continues today by the wearing of holy medals or the use of icons. Every Catholic book store, or other related business, sells millions of medals and icons of the church's many different saints for protection against a host of threats. Noting that the ancient pagans wore the same kind of charms, or believed in the power of religious icons of their g-ds or saints, T.W. Doane makes the connections of the ancient custom to the present-day: *"The Christians also used amulets with the name or monogram of the g-d Serapis engraved thereon.... even the charm which is worn by the Christians at the present day, has none other than the monogram of [the g-d] Bacchus engraved thereon, i.e., I H S."* Bible Myths, p. 405.)

With such "divine" cures bringing a steady flow of money-paying faithful patients to the church, that same church certainly had no need for medical science, and least of all for the "heretics" that promoted scientific experiments. This attitude is why some of the most famous scientists in European history, Leonardo Da Vinci included, had to often work in secret and in fear for their lives!

As yet one more example of the church's relentless war on secular education, early in the seventeenth century one of history's greatest scientists was put on trial for his life charged in an ecclesiastical court with heresy. Despite his reputation and his advanced age, before the mock trial he had been tortured relentlessly by the disciples of Jesus Christ. His heretical crime was to challenge the church's position that the earth was the center of the universe and that the universe revolved around the earth.

After he could no longer endure the torture, and remembering that his colleague Giordano Bruno had been burned at the stake for conducting the same research, this broken old man recanted. Being led before a group of pious Christian priests and clerics the great Galileo admitted the following: *"I, Galileo, being in my seventieth year, being a prisoner and on my knees, and before your Eminences, having before my eyes the Holy Gospel, which I touch with my hands, abjure, curse, and detest the error and the heresy of the movement of the earth."* And thus the church, that had already declared the earth to be flat because that is what the bible teaches, was secure in its belief that the earth did not move but stood stationary at the center of the universe. Galileo published his work, Dialogo in 1632. Essentially building upon the theory of Copernicus, he was able to demonstrate the fallacy of the church's teaching that the earth was the center of the universe and everything revolved around it.

Perhaps all this madness is best summed up by one historian who wrote that within the Christian Church of the Middle Ages a heretic was a man with an opinion! (Reinach, Orpheus, p. 318).

FINALLY THE LIGHT OF TRUTH AND KNOWLEDGE SURFACES

It would not be until 1865 that the major crack came in the strict domination of Christianity over education. Up until that time virtually all universities appointed religious authorities to supervise all fields of scientific inquiry. In 1865 Cornell University was founded and, under a great deal of protest, became the first major school in Christendom to appoint a non-cleric as its dean. However, when the academic world finally broke free of the murderous grip of fanatic Christian ignorance, intellectual freedom was far from being a reality.

Even after the clergy could no longer arrest, torture and burn people for thinking, questioning, or for reading a forbidden book, they still waged a relentless war on secular education by using their considerable influence with the uneducated masses forever in fear of eternal damnation. Notice again the same tactics used by the Church who controlled not only knowledge but salvation as well. In the majority of Christian churches members were and still are told either directly not read certain materials, or they are warned away through more subtle means, such as sermons ridiculing and discrediting a particular work or author. We at Bet Emet encounter such a blindness to the facts and fear of truth occasionally as our articles are sent to others but we cannot be deterred from the quest and calling we have received from God. God is sacred and not a book which can be shown to be lies; lies that have replaced God's Truth no less for millions who never do their own study to see if "they be in the faith"... "the faith once given to the saints".

Both the Catholic Church and her Protestant Sister still dictates to their members what they can and cannot read. In 1515 the church, alarmed by the number of "heretical" books being published, moved to put an end to this danger. Thus was born the *Imprimatur*, the official Vatican stamp of approval received by works that are in line with Catholic dogma. The office is still in operation and any good Catholic book will contain this stamp of approval on the title page. (Lea, A History of the Inquisition, Volume 111, p. 615.)

For any fundamentalist who finally works up the courage to get outside the carefully screened and recommended reading of their church the reasons for these warnings become painfully obvious. No where is this more true than in a critical study of the New Testament. Such a critical study of the New Testament will reveal to you gross distortions of the Old Testament for purposes of indoctrination by anti-Semitic Gentiles. The process really began with the corruption of the translation of the Jewish Scriptures by the Essenes of Egypt when they were also involved in sun-worship:
<http://bennoah1.freewebsites.com>. In their never-ending quest for religious legitimacy and status, the writers of the New Testament have not hesitated to twist, distort, pervert, and concoct Old Testament verses as expediency dictated. Examples of their dishonest display of propagandistic propensities are abundantly evident to anyone with a reasonably critical eye. Such deceptions and distortions by the writers of the New Testament fall into three broad categories: misquotations, nonquotes, and misinterpretations. A misquotation is defined as deliberately misquoting an Old Testament passage; a nonquote consists of quoting a non-existent Old Testament passage, and a misinterpretation consists of correctly quoting an Old Testament passage while distorting the meaning intended. The New Testament is guilty on all the counts in hundred of places and only a reasonably critical eye and knowledge of Old Testament Scripture as take from the Jewish Bible and not the altered Christian Old Testaments is necessary to spot such perversions in the New Testament.

If one is interested in individual examples of such New Testament distortions of the Old Testament and the Jewish Scriptures one needs only to examine our web pages at : <http://returningtofaithofyeshua.freesevers.com> and <http://paulproblem.faithweb.com> as they contains ample evidence to prove our point. **But you must see it for yourself.** This is the purpose of not only this series of articles but Bet Emet Ministries; to reveal the truth for New Testament believers by exposing the unsoundness of such a document in hopes one will repent of such false beliefs once he sees the truth for himself. We must always remember that with every lie exposed and repented of one takes a closer step toward the God of Truth.

More to follow.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #5

I have spent some time laying the foundation for this present study. I have labored to present to you the history of your faith as championed by the Catholic Church and as inherited by the Protestant Church. You need to understand that they literally controlled and yet control what you are to believe as your faith as a Christian. They do this through both preaching of false dogmas and doctrines as well as point you to a document which is full of error and lies taken from pagan mystery religions. The Catholic Church not only had possession of the New Testament manuscripts but controlled what you heard and what you were "to believe". By the time that the books of the New Testament would be printed in the language of the people for all to read and see for themselves, hundreds and hundreds of changes had already been made in the text by monks and adept "theologians" who made sure the manuscripts carried the "current teachings" of the Catholic Church. The New Testament was to be a reflection not of truth or the original faith of Yeshua but of Catholic theology as it evolved by emperor's decisions and majority votes; from one Church Council to the next. Over time by majority vote the New Testament took upon itself a life of its own which can be shown to be quite different from the doctrines believed by the Jerusalem Church.

Perhaps one of the most pointed questions I get in my e-mails over and over is this:

"Does it make sense that God would give man His revelation and then stand by helplessly as it became garbled and corrupted? Such an idea is preposterous."

I understand the desperation of such a question but the student does not grasp the incalculable damage done to the New Testament over the centuries by the Catholic Church. He lacks the facts in the matter at hand. Once you see this for yourself then such a question needs not to be asked because you have proof as your answer.

Ironically, I totally agree with that statement! If a Divine Being, who we are told created the whole universe, transmitted His divine will into the writing of a book, then it makes no sense that He'd allow that book to become corrupt. The Creator of the universe would be perfection manifest and beyond error, whereas man is notoriously corrupt in everything he puts his hand to! This is the rule by which one should judge any human-proclaimed holy writing, and one to keep in mind as we NOW consider the facts pertaining to and the origins of the New Testament.

WHERE ARE THE ORIGINAL MANUSCRIPTS?

To get an overall picture let's start by first noting that there is no such thing as an original manuscript of the New Testament. This means that there is no known prototype from which later copies of the New Testament were made. To the contrary, there are several so-called families of Greek texts, none of which agrees with the other, that stand behind the present day New Testament.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice I said no "two" (2) New Testament manuscripts agrees with each other?

Take time to let that statement sink in.

The more important of these families of Greek texts are the Alexandrian texts, the Western texts, the Caesarean texts and the Byzantine Texts. Metzger, A Textual Commentary On The Greek New Testament, pp. XVI, XVII states that the Alexandrian texts are represented by the codex Vaticanus and the codex Sinaiticus. The Western text were those used by the church fathers Irenaeus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Marcion and Tatian. The Caesarean text apparently originated in Egypt and is thought to have been brought to Caesarea where it was used by Eusebius and others.

The state of these texts can be seen in the admission of the turn-of-the-century editors of The Catholic Encyclopedia, who represented a church that even today fully believes and teaches the infallibility of the bible.

Now pay attention to the next quotation. **Although admitting to thousands of conflicting scriptures in the New Testament text families**, they nevertheless offer this weak excuse: "It is easy to understand how numerous would be the readings of a text transcribed as often as the Bible, and, as only one reading can represent the original, it follows that all the others are necessarily faulty. Mill **estimated the variants of the New Testament at 30,000, and since the discovery of so many MSS. [i.e., manuscripts] unknown to Mill, this number has greatly increased**" (Vol. IV, p. 498. The Catholic Encyclopedia, published in 1910). I need to stop here and ask you a very important question.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that the Catholic Encyclopedia estimated 30,000 variants and contradictions in the New Testament manuscripts in 1910 and do you know that the true number is much higher because of the newer archeological discoveries in New Testament studies since 1910?

Answer for yourself: Are you aware before reading this article that the Greek "New Testament" manuscripts from which the New Testament in your Christian Bible is taken had "thousands and thousands" of conflicting scriptures?

Answer for yourself: Can you give an answer why when considering the Masoretic Text of the Old Testament as handed down by the Jewish Scribes is almost 99% accurate with just minimal discrepancies whereas the Greek Scriptures handed down from the non-Jewish Catholic Church has thousands and thousands of "conflicting scriptures"?

Answer for yourself: Remember the question posed earlier: *"Does it make sense that God would give man His revelation and then stand by helplessly as it became garbled and corrupted?"* Now I ask you "What does it appear to you that God is preserving as His Word; the New Testament or the Old Testament?"

Take time to let that statement sink in.

Concerning the New Testament Gospels the editors note: "The existence of numerous and, at times, considerable differences between the four canonical Gospels is a fact which has long been noticed and which all scholars readily admit" (Volume VI, p. 658. The Catholic Encyclopedia was published in 1910).

LETS GET MORE CURRENT IN OUR INFORMATION

Regarding the lack of uniformity of these various texts, a later work, Forlong's Encyclopedia of Religion, tells us: "There are some 1,760 MSS. to be compared; and the **various readings are computed at 150,000.**"

Answer for yourself: Now did you notice that the number of variants and conflicts are now over 150,000?

Answer for yourself: In all honesty where is the work of the Holy Spirit in this?

The revisers confess to 100,000 in 1,500 MSS" (Vol. I, p. 316.) In other words here we are being told that there are 150,000 conflicting words or verses in the so-called original Greek New Testament manuscripts from which Christianity derives its holy book.

Take time to let that statement sink in.

Answer for yourself: Can you honestly say that the New Testament, according to the facts you have seen, is the work of the Holy Spirit especially in light of the facts regarding how meticulously and with such few discrepancies the Jewish Old Testament was preserved by the Jewish Scribes?

NOW FOR THE REAL BAD NEWS...CHRISTIAN SCHOLARS ADMIT THAT "SOMEWHERE" IN ALL THE CONFLICTING N.T. MANUSCRIPTS IS TRUTH...."SOMEWHERE".....BUT WHERE?

However since the above reference works were first published the discovery of ancient New Testament manuscripts have more than doubled in numbers. By 1989 the Munster Institute for New Testament Textual Research had catalogued **5,488 Greek New Testament manuscripts**. Only 59 of these contain the entire New Testament, while roughly 1500 contain only the Gospels. The present count of New Testament MSS. include 96 papyri, 299 uncials, 2,812 minuscule and 2,281 lectionaries, or works containing selected passages for use in church services (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 488). **The relevant information that you need to know about these 5,488 manuscripts is that virtually all of them differ in some mayor or minor degrees one from the other!**

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that now, out of 5,488 New Testament manuscripts that no 2 agree?

EVEN CHRISTIAN BIBLES WILL TODAY TELL YOU THE FACTS IF YOU LOOK

After noting that the Gospels of Matthew, Mark, Luke and John alone are preserved in some 3,500 different and often conflicting manuscripts, the editors of a contemporary work entitled, The Complete Gospels, bluntly admit that, **"The Greek texts behind our English translation [of the New Testament] is a reconstruction produced by patient and exacting comparison of thousands of differences in wording among the numerous copies"** (The Complete Gospels, p. 2).

By way of defending such damaging information, Christian apologist and fundamentalist Eric V. Snow first acknowledges that there are **200,000 estimated variations in the New Testament**, but then excuses this fact with the following remark: "Scholars Geisler and Nix, building upon the work of F.J.A. Hort, said only about 1/8 [of the 200,000] have weight, with 1/60 [of the 200,000] **being 'substantial variation.'**"

Answer for yourself: Can you feel secure knowing that your religious belief system whereby you are trusting New Testament dogmas and doctrines for your salvation can be shown to have **"substantial variations"?**

Eric V. Snow adds to his so-called defense by also quoting the well-known NT scholars C.F. Sitterly and J.H. Greenlee as saying: ***"Such a wealth of evidence makes it all the more certain that the original words of the NT have been preserved somewhere within the MSS."***

What Christian scholars like Eric's two experts are saying is that somewhere in all the jumble of the surviving disagreeing New Testament manuscripts

there must be some originality...but where!)

Answer for yourself: As a typical New Testament believer, have you when reading the New Testament, the ability to pick out from these "jumbled and disagreeing New Testament Scriptures" what is originally true from what is false since the Christian scholars attest that "truth" is jumbled somewhere within it?

Answer for yourself: Are you qualified to read the New Testament and have the ability to discern "truth" from "error" on every page?

Answer for yourself: Have you invested years of scholarly research in order to equip yourself with necessary skills that ensure you can pick out the lies from the truth when reading the New Testament?

I never was real good with math but let's get out our handy pocket calculators. Take the 200,000 NT variations admitted by Christian scholars and divide by 8; we have **25,000 NT variations** which quoted scholars like Geisler and Nix said have weight. Now, let's divide 200,000 by 60. We come up with **3,333 New Testament variations which these two Christians scholars said were substantial! Taking the low number of 3,333 substantial variations, we still have a major headache for those who uphold the infallibility of the New Testament!"**

Answer for yourself: Have you ever thought that you should ask your Pastor how many of these 3,333 **substantial** New Testament variations conflict in matters of **salvation** let alone in doctrines where your life-style is either pleasing or displeasing to God?

Speaking of Doctors Westcott and Hort, fundamentalist minister, educator and author Dr. D.A. Waite criticizes their work by charging that Hort deliberately understates the number of variances between his reconstructed Greek New Testament translation and the "original" Textus Receptus, or the "received" Greek text behind the King James Version of the New Testament. Waite notes that he counted some 5,604 places where Westcott and Hort "rejected the Textus Receptus", **which includes 9,970 Greek words that were either added, subtracted or changed from what he terms the original Textus Receptus.**

Answer for yourself: Did you hear that? At least 9,970 words were either **added or subtracted or changed** from the earlier translation of the Bible; the Textus Receptus?

Answer for yourself: Do you recall the following verses from the Old Testament?

Deut. 4:2

2 Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you.

Deut 12:32

32 What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it.

Answer for yourself: Did any of these 9,970 words which were either "added, subtracted, or changed" in the New Testament affect, influence, or change Biblical doctrines or dogmas from what the Old Testament once said?

You better listen to what I just asked. The horrible fact is that many do! Over the years my research, as well as the research conducted by many others have revealed the same results. The tragic fact is that the typical believer in the Church pew has not the slightest idea to the corruption which has occurred to the New Testament. **The typical New Testament believer would literally die if he knew the horrible and severe violations does to the Masoretic text by the writers of the New Testament and their subsequent translations which are filled with gross distortions of the Old Testament for purposes of**

indoctrination. In their never-ending quest for religious legitimacy and status, the writers of the New Testament have not hesitated to twist, distort, pervert, and concoct Old Testament verses as expediency dictated, and subsequent translations of the New Testament followed suit in the steps of their predecessors.

Waite calculated that these changes came to **45.9 pages of differences** within the whole of the New Testament (The Four-Fold Superiority of the King James Version, Collingswood, New Jersey, 1992, pp. 5-6. This reference is taken from Waite's book Defending the King James Bible: The Four-Fold Superiority of the King James Version). The next time you go to church and read from the New Testament I want you to count 45 pages and hold them between your thumb and realize that this much "verbiage" in the New Testament is considered by scholars to be **substantial variations !**

Again, such statistics are not very reassuring to "infallible New Testament" advocates. However, as I will endeavor to show, the above figures are the least of the problems inherent with the New Testament. On with the next study.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #6

Over the past centuries countless Christian ministers and scholars, both Protestant and Catholic, have appealed to the "original Greek" of the New Testament while attempting to make some theological argument, which may have indeed formed the foundation of an important doctrine. The question I wish to put forward to you is this:

Answer for yourself: What comprises the original Greek New Testament?

Answer for yourself: Is it, as Christian scholars attest, to be found in the so-called Textus Receptus?

We shall now see.

THE PROTESTANTS HAVE TO COME UP WITH THEIR OWN BIBLE SINCE LEAVING THE CATHOLIC CHURCH AND THE VULGATE

When the protesting children of Roman Christianity left their mother church they also rejected its bible. That is, they rejected Jerome's Latin Vulgate, traditionally said to have been translated by Jerome from an early New Testament version called the Old Latin, which itself rested on the authority of the Alexandrian and Western Texts. Of necessity the newly designated Protestants had to find another source of authority for their new-found faith. For this need they turned to what essentially was the only alternative—the large collection of New Testament manuscripts known as the Byzantine Greek Texts, so-called because they surfaced inside the Eastern (Orthodox) Christian Church, which had formally split from the Western, or Roman Catholic Church in the eleventh century.

In many important instances the Byzantine Texts differed greatly from both the Alexandrian and Western Texts, and, as already noted, they also differed greatly in comparison with each other.

Answer for yourself: Do you remember that previously we stated that no "two" Greek New Testament manuscripts agreed with each other?

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that not only did the Byzantine Texts differ from the Alexandrian and Western Texts, but they also disagreed with "each other" as well in the same family of Texts?

This meant that in order to use the collective Byzantine Texts Protestant scholars had to reconstruct a new Greek bible.

THE ERASMUS GREEK NEW TESTAMENT...CALLED "THE LEAST

CAREFULLY PREPARED BOOK EVER PUBLISHED"...HOW HONEST WAS HE... AND HIS NEW TESTAMENT?

Such an attempt had already been made by the great Dutch Catholic scholar Desiderius Erasmus, who worked in Baste, Switzerland. But his Greek New Testament, printed in 1516, left a lot to be desired.

Among the many faults in Erasmus' reconstruction efforts was that he was able to locate only two rather inferior Byzantine manuscripts for the greater part of his work. (Metzger, *op. cit.*, p. xxi). The editors of The Cambridge History of the Bible add this: "Further, while Erasmus suggested that he had consulted many manuscripts, in fact he used few in the preparation of the text he published, and most of these he found in Baste." Vol. 1, p. 60).

Answer for yourself: First of all did you notice that Erasmus, the first man to give the Protestants the Greek New Testament from the Byzantine Texts "lied" about his production?

Further, Erasmus used only the Complutensian Polyglot for his translation of the book of Revelation, which indeed in his copy was missing the last page, or six whole verses of the last chapter. As a substitute for the missing versus Erasmus simply used Jerome's Latin Vulgate for "what he supposed the Greek text should read" (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 490). So after all part of the Catholic Bible crept into the Protestant Bible anyway!

On top of this, Erasmus is known to have tampered with the text of the Byzantine manuscripts he was using. For example they didn't contain the infamous, and completely spurious passage of I John 5:7, which falsely acknowledges the doctrine of the Trinity. Virtually all scholars acknowledge that this passage was the work of a monk copyist in the fourth century AD. It is known as the Johannine Comma, and, as the editors of Harper's Bible Commentary state, "This gloss [lie!], apparently motivated by early trinitarian debates, is not found in any Greek manuscript before the fifteenth century" (Harper's Bible Commentary, p. 1294.)

Answer for yourself: Is it a fair assumption to say that Erasmus' theology was instrumental in creation of his New Testament regardless of what the Greek manuscripts he used "contained within them" or "did not contain within them"?

Answer for yourself: Besides this "doctrinal creationism" do you know where other doctrinal "creationisms" lie within the New Testament which God never intended you believe or cherish?

Most modern Bible translations agree that I John 5:7 is a false insertion, and do not include it in their work. Even the extremely liberal Living Bible makes a note about this scripture! Most bible commentaries, such as Peake's Commentary on the Bible, are forced to admit that I John 5:7 doesn't belong in the Bible, noting that, "no respectable Greek manuscript contains it." (p. 1030.)

The verse is, in fact, not found in the earliest copies of the Vulgate itself; although it is included in the present Catholic bible. After rendering the spurious verse in the main text The New Testament, a Catholic translation from the Latin Vulgate, says in the footnote: "According to the evidence of many manuscripts, and the majority of commentators, these verses should read: "For there are three that bear witness: the Spirit, and the water, and the blood: and these three are one." The Holy See [the papacy] reserves to itself the right to pass finally on the origin of the present reading." (p. 638.)

Religious historian Salomon Reinach writes: "The Roman Church refused to bow to evidence. 'How,' she argued, 'if these verses were an interpolation, could the Holy Spirit who guides and directs the Church, have allowed her to regard this lofty affirmation of the Trinity as authentic, and permitted its insertion in the official edition of the sacred books?'" (Orpheus, p. 260.)

Again the Church and the New Testament believer make a fatal assumption; namely, that the Holy Spirit is

directing the Christian Church in such plagiarism of pagan doctrines as truth!

When his fellow Catholics complained that he'd left this passage out, Erasmus supplied it in his next edition on the justification that a Byzantine MSS. in Dublin contained the verse. However, not having access to the Dublin MSS., Erasmus simply took the text from the Latin Vulgate and translated the Latin into Greek (The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1, p. 60).

These examples and many others tell us why Erasmus' Greek New Testament contains words that do not agree with any known Greek text. Moreover, Erasmus' translation of the last six verses of Revelation are still found in the so-called original Greek New Testament.

Relevant to this point is that Erasmus, in trying to be the first get a Protestant Greek translation of the Byzantine Texts into print, threw together in a few months what his competitors at Alcalá de Henares University took years to assemble. The University's text came to be known as the Complutensian Polyglot, which, as previously noted, Erasmus used in his translation of the book of Revelation! One contemporary critic in England called Erasmus' work the "least carefully penned book ever published", which is echoed by the editors of The Cambridge History of the Bible, who conservatively say of Erasmus' work that it shows "plainly the signs of undue haste" (Vol. I, p. 59).

ERASMUS' GREEK NEW TESTAMENT (TEXTUS RECEPTUS) ... THE FOUNDATION FOR ALL LATER GREEK NEW TESTAMENTS

However, the main problem with Erasmus' translation, or reconstruction, which became known as the Textus Receptus or the Received Text, is that it formed the foundation for later Greek New Testaments, and hence it is essentially the "original Greek" of the present day Protestant New Testament and the one proclaimed as God's infallible word by fundamentalist Christians.

And we must not forget that truthful Christian Biblical scholars call his work "the least carefully penned book ever published".

However, such claims can only be made by ignoring the embarrassing history behind the Textus Receptus. The Textus Receptus got its name by way of the Elzovir brothers, who printed bibles in Leiden and later in Amsterdam. In the preface to their second edition of the Greek New Testament of 1633 is found the following: "Therefore you dear reader now have the text received by all, in which we give nothing changed or corrupted." From this sentence the term Textus Receptus (The Received Text) was derived (Metzger, op. cit., pp. xxii, xxiii).

STEPHANUS....THE KJV...I GUESS HE MEANT WELL...BUT...

The next translator to try his hand at producing a Greek New Testament from the Byzantine Texts was a Parisian reconstructionist printer and part-time scholar named Robert Estienne (or Etienne), who is better known as Stephanus. Called the editio Regia, his Greek Bible was published in Geneva in 1551 and must have been more to the liking of the Protestant world because it essentially became "the original Greek" behind the best known of all Protestant New Testaments, which is to say the Authorized Version or the 1611 King James Bible. It was this same Stephanus, by the way, who first employed the use of chapter and verse divisions in the Christian bible. This is a major problem in itself for often the correct interpretation of passages is severely hampered by his chapter divisions. Isaiah chapter 52 and 53 are prime examples.

THE ERASMUS' TEXT REBORN...IN THE KJV 1611

Although the concept of chapter and verse divisions was in itself a much-needed improvement for bible study in some instances, Stephanus' efforts in this area have been greatly criticized because his divisions often broke sentences apart or inserted chapter breaks in places that broke the continuity of a story. The oddity in this situation is that numerous "the bible is the infallible word of God" advocates have argued over the years against anyone trying to correct certain problems caused by Stephanus' clumsy divisions by declaring that "one doesn't mess around with the infallible word of God!"

But the real problem with the Stephanus translation is that he relied heavily on the translation of Erasmus' Greek text. In fact Stephanus' translation is but a repeat of the fifth Erasmusian text with variants. As Erasmus before him, Stephanus also used the Greek of the above mentioned Complutensian Polyglot. This translation was undertaken in 1502 under the direction of Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros, Archbishop of Toledo, Spain, by license of Pope Leo X. Cardinal de Cisneros founded the University of Alcala de Henares at Complutum where the work on his Complutensian Polyglot began in 1502, with the New Testament finally being completed in 1514 and formally published in 1522 after the pope gave his permission. It was against this translation work that Erasmus was competing, as he wanted to be the first to get a translation of the Byzantine text into print to chiefly satisfy commercial demands. Polyglot bibles, by the way, are editions containing a biblical text in several languages, usually in parallel columns (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 601).

In his work the good cardinal used both the great codices of the Catholic Church (i.e., the Alexandrian and Western Texts, which were loaned to him by the Vatican) and the Latin Vulgate itself to augment his limited collection of Byzantine codices, all of which tells us immediately both the underlying scholarship of Stephanus' text and that of the 1611 King James Bible (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. V, pp. 289-290).

In other words the KJV Bible, the production of Stephanus, is a mixture of Catholic manuscripts and Byzantine Eastern texts. It is a mixture!

The editors of The Cambridge History of the Bible write, "For their Greek text the [KJV] translators worked from Stephanus and [Theodore] Beza, without any sure principles of textual criticism to guide them[and they did make extensive use of [the]Geneva and Rhemes [Bibles]" (Vol. 1, p 167. The KJV translators essentially used the 1588, 1589 and 1598 editions of Beza's work).

As to the so-called translation of Theodore Beza (whose name was given to the famous Codex Bezae), even though he published nine consecutive *corrected* editions of his Textus Receptus (from 1565 - 1604 with a tenth published after his death), his foundational "original" Greek was simply borrowed from Stephanus' translation, which, remember, was borrowed from the work of Erasmus: "He [Beza] made little significant change from the fourth edition of Estienne [i.e., Stephanus] . . . which he had before him in preparing his own edition" (The Catholic Encyclopedia, Vol. V, pp. 289-290).

In other words the "inspired original Greek" behind our modern Protestant New Testament, the fundamentalist-proclaimed infallible word of God, is traceable only to the sixteenth century where we find that it was essentially a piece-meal composition as reconstructed by three different men:

- A Catholic Cardinal
- A Catholic Scholar
- A Parisian Printer

Answer for yourself: How does that make you feel knowing that as a Protestant your Bible and New Testament is the work of only 3 men, let alone Catholics?

Answer for yourself: Do you think that their theologies "crept" into the text in places where you believe to be "inspired"?

It you have paid attention so far you already have been given examples where it had!

Answer for yourself: And who knows how and by what means these three came to select from the differing texts the final verses for their "original Greek" New Testament?

IN A NUTSHELL

The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, p 353. and The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ea., vol. 3, p. 518 attest:

The history of the KJV is summed up thus: "Sixty years after the first edition of the Bible was printed, a Dutch scholar Erasmus in 1516 printed a Greek language version of the New Testament. He used only three or four available twelfth century copy manuscripts [he actually used two!] and a later copy of Jerome's Latin translation which he translated back into Greek; this translation had now gone through countless copies and had been converted from Greek to Latin and back to Greek. This mishmash brought about a self originating, concocted Greek text producing a unique reading never to be found in any other known Greek manuscript. Unfortunately this artificial perverted text became the basis for the received text, the Textus Receptus, which was later used as the base text of the King James Bible. In 1611, King James of England had the Textus Receptus adopted into the King James Bible, including all the error in the Erasmus Text. This became the basis for most Protestant translations in Europe until the end of the nineteenth century (Armageddon 2033: Facts on Bible Time Prophecies, Leafy Grove Keston, Kent, England: The Bible Research and Investigation Company, 1996, chapter 4, "The Clean Up of Scripture").

At any rate, the work of these three men stand behind what is regarded by fundamentalist Christians as the most sacred of all bible translations, which is to say the King James Version (KJV) of the Holy Bible. This is a joke!

Answer for yourself: How comfortable are you resting your eternal security upon the work of 3 men, 3 Catholics, let alone considering the hundreds of thousands of conflicting scriptures contained in such a document called the New Testament?

More to follow.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #7

Answer for yourself: How much do you know about the King James Version of the Bible?

Ever since as authorization by King James I back in the seventeenth century, the King James Version translation has been "the bible" of the majority of English-speaking Protestants. Indeed when Protestants get into the argument of biblical infallibility it is virtually always the KJV that they hold up as the model of perfection. Even when other translations are used the majority of fundamentalist ministers strongly recommend that they be "checked for accuracy" against the KJV. This is why of all the countless translations since 1611 the KJV is by far the world's best seller. But having already seen the real foundation behind the "original Greek" of the KJV, let's now look a little closer at the history of the translation itself.

When present-day Christian fundamentalist declare that the KJV is the "inerrant" or "infallible" word of God, they probably don't know that the KJV translation has undergone many changes—word deletions, additions and changes—in the last 350 years; they probably don't know that the present KJV lacks fourteen entire books (the so-called Apocrypha) which were in the original translation of 1611 but were dropped in the 1769 revision. They probably have never been enlightened to the fact that the KJV or the Authorized Version was never authorized by anyone other than England's King James I. Their ministers have conveniently forgotten to tell them that the original KJV had a calendar of annual holy days which all believers were expected to follow and that these days included such notable Roman Catholic examples as the Purification of the Virgin Mary, The Annunciation of Our Lady and Innocent's Day. In fact, fundamentalists ministers like to declare that the KJV was so popular with the common people that all other translations fell into disuse, which, they claim, indicates that it had God's blessing. But the truth is that when the KJV was printed all other translations ceased to be published. Its triumph over previous translations is due to that fact and that fact alone. "It [the KJV] replaced the Bishop's Bible in public use because after 1611 no other folio Bible was printed" (The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. I, p.168).

Concerning the accuracy of the translation work of the 1611 KJV, history doesn't paint a flattering picture. In 1881, upon the release of the Revised Version (a reworked edition of the 1769 KJV, which was a revision of the original 1611), the revisers had this to say about the so-called Authorized Version of 1611:

"The texts relied on are founded, for the most part, on MSS. [manuscripts] of late date, few in number, and used with little critical skill . . . "

As an example of that last point we may note that during the translation of the KJV disputed points about a given text were settled by a vote of the translators, which, in the case of a deadlock, meant that "God's infallible word" often depended on the deciding vote of the chairman of the translating

committee—and his vote depended entirely upon his own religious views
(Forlong's Encyclopedia of Religions, vol. 1, p.300)

Furthermore to this confusion we can add the political and religious views of his majesty King James I.

THE INFLUENCE OF KING JAMES ON HIS BIBLE

As already noted the man behind the KJV was England's King James I. James' influence on the translation bearing his name has been negatively commented on by numerous scholars, which is a point that is all but unknown to most Protestants. In fact, the king hand-picked the scholars for the work, carefully selecting only those who were both politically and doctrinally in accord with his views. On 22 July 1604 King James "appointed certain learned men, to the number of four and fifty, for translation of the Bible" (The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. 1, p 164).

Before they set to work the king also issued his hand-picked so-called translation committee fifteen rules which they had to follow in their work. One rule was that the very popular Bishops' Bible, which then was in use throughout the Anglican Church, "had to be followed and as little altered as the Truth of the original will permit. When a word hath divers significations, that to be kept which hath been most commonly used by the most of the Ancient Fathers, being agreeable to the Propriety of the Place, and the Analogy of the Faith.... These translations to be used when they agree better with the text than the Bishops' Bible; viz., Tyndale's, Matthew's, Coverdale's, Whitchurch's [the Great Bible], [and the] Geneva . . ." (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed., vol.3, pp. 533-534).

Scholars complain that fifteen such rules certainly tied the hands of the translators. But more than this, the last rule adds additional complications to the claim of an infallible word of God.

Because the Bishops' Bible played such an important part in the translation of the KJV, it is essential to this study to look into its history. In 1526 William Tyndale, working from the Greek of Erasmus' printed text, produced his New Testament, which, it should be noted, was not authorized by the Christian Church (Metzger, op. Cit., pp. xxi, xxii). After he was burned at the stake for this heresy, John Rogers, a friend of Tyndale's, printed the so-called Thomas Matthews Bible in 1537 by simply using William Tyndale's New Testament and Pentateuch. Thomas Matthews is thought to have been an alias for John Rogers (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed. Vol. 3, p. 532). In 1539 a lawyer named Richard Taverner published (many historians call it "pirated") a revision of the Matthew Bible, which was followed in 1539 by yet another revision by Miles Coverdale. Unlike the previous editions or translations, Coverdale's work had the official sanction of King Henry VIII's ministers. When finished, this new translation became known as the Great Bible because of its large format (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 759). However, Coverdale not only based his revision on the Matthew Bible he also consulted the Latin Vulgate and Erasmus' edition of the Greek text—the latter of which, as the reader probably noticed, was the Greek behind the Matthew Bible to begin with (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed. Vol. 3, p. 532).

During the reign of Queen Mary I, who tried to revert England back to Catholicism after the death of her father and brother, King Henry VIII and King Edward VI, the printing of all English language bibles in the kingdom was stopped. Those who wanted to produce bibles in English had to go over to the European Continent. It was during this time that the Geneva Bible was produced (so-called because it was printed in Geneva, Switzerland). The New Testament was translated by William Whittingham, pastor of the English Church in Geneva, whose "original Greek" authority for the work can be traced directly to the translation of Erasmus—an important point considering the Geneva Bible also played a part in the translation work of the KJV.

In short order the Geneva Bible became the bible of the English speaking world and was widely used in both

England and Scotland, especially during the reign of Queen Elizabeth I. However, as the editors of The Oxford Companion to the Bible point out, "Its extremely Protestant notes were offensive to the [English] bishops, and in 1568 a tension of the Great Bible was published, which became known as the Bishops' Bible, owing to the great number of bishops on the committee" (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed. Vol. 3, p. 759).

In other words, the scholarship behind the Bishops' Bible was the Great Bible, which, as noted above, was rooted in Erasmus' Greek New Testament, and which also formed another building block of the KJV. We can add to this point that the KJV translators understood that they had a need to translate certain passages to uphold King James' "*Divine Right of Kings*" doctrine, which was the cornerstone of his reign—and one, by the way, that ultimately caused the English Civil War and the death of his son, King Charles I.

ALTERATION OF HEBREW AND GREEK WORDS ON PURPOSE

If the overall history behind the KJV weren't already bad enough, many scholars also point out that in certain places the KJV translators changed the meaning of the original Hebrew and Greek words to better fit the doctrines of their own Anglican faith. That this complaint is valid is easily noticeable in the role call of King James' hand-picked translation committee. They include Dr. John Bois, Dean of Canterbury, Lancelot Andrews, Dean of Westminster and Bishop of Winchester, Dr. William Bedwell, an Anglican theologian, Miles Smith, Bishop of Gloucester and Dr. George, Abbott and Archbishop of Canterbury (The Cambridge History of the Bible, Vol. I, p. 164). Couple all of this with the fact that the KJV translators were working from a very faulty and piece-meal Greek reconstruction that had flowed from the pens and whims of essentially three men in the previous century, and we have the truth, or perhaps it is better said, we see the farce behind the so-called infallible King James Bible.

This history tells us why Hugh Broughton, the foremost Hebrew scholar of England at that time the KJV was published, rejected the suggestion that he endorse the work by saying that he would rather "be rent to pieces by wild horses than have had any part in the urging of such a wretched version of the Bible on the poor people. "

As an example of the truth behind Broughton's opinion, just two short years after the release of 1611 KJV a revision was released that differed from the 1611 original in over four hundred places. In 1769 Dr. Benjamin Blayney of Oxford produced another edition of the KJV which he also called The Authorized Version, although scholars point out that it was never formally authorized by either king or Parliament (The Oxford Companion of the Bible, p. 760). It was this new edition that dropped the fourteen books of the Apocrypha from the "infallible word of God" while at the same time introducing countless other changes to the text. However, changes to the text, whether authorized or not, was only part of the problem.

In 1851 the American Bible Society compared six different publisher's editions of the King James Bible then in circulation and discovered over 24,000 variations in the text—which was understandable since the printers had to typeset the bibles by hand. Even so, one minister rightly asked how could there be an inerrant King James Bible when even the different editions had ten's of thousands of variant readings? Such a sad state didn't go unnoticed and in 1870 the Church of England formally authorized a revision of the KJV. Fifty scholars, most of whom were Anglicans, went to work. In the New Testament alone some thirty thousand changes were made, with some five thousand based on what they called "a better Greek text." That last notation means that since the time of Erasmus, Cardinal Ximenes de Cisneros and Stephanus' piece-meal compositions, men had been steadily working to produce a better "original" Greek New Testament, which the new translators were now going to employ in their new translation. All of this brings us to the present day "original" Greek New Testament.

ORIGINAL GREEK...WHERE IS IT AT?

The present day Greek New Testament is essentially the work of two scholars, Dr. Brooke F. Westcott and Dr. Fenton J.A. Hort, who, in 1881, produced an "original" Greek New Testament entitled, The New Testament: A

Translation from the Original Greek. What we need to note here, however, is that Doctors Westcott and Hort primarily used Stephanus' Textus Receptus augmented by another translation by Professor Konstantin von Tischendorf for their work. As neither Stephanus nor his predecessors ever saw, let alone used an "original" Greek New Testament manuscript for their work, one wonders how Doctors Westcott and Hort came up with the second part of their title, **"A Translation from the Original Greek"?**

This point aside, not long after Westcott and Hort's work the Christian world was presented with yet another "original" Greek New Testament by the efforts of Dr. Eberhard Nestle (Novam Testamentum graece) printed in Stuttgart in 1898. Important to this study is the fact that Nestle primarily used the text of Westcott and Hort, who used Stephanus' work, who, remember, used the translation of Erasmus' piece-meal reconstruction. However, even this effort was just a stepping stone in the history of the "original" Greek New Testament. Nestle's "original" Greek New Testament was eventually corrected and augmented by Doctors Erwin Nestle and Kurt Aland, whose work is known as the Nestle/Aland Greek Text.

Earlier in these articles I quoted fundamentalist minister Dr. D.A. Waite's complaint that F.J.A. Hort and B.F. Westcott had either added, subtracted or changed almost 10,000 words in their Greek New Testament in comparison to the Textus Receptus of Erasmus and Stephanus. Dr. Waite noted that this amounted to 45.9 pages of changes. In his book, *Defending the King James Bible*, Waite offers this further complaint about the current Nestle/Aland Greek New Testament, which, as noted, is essentially based on the work of Westcott and Hort, who based their translation on the work of the Received Text of Staphanus and Erasmus: **"The fact that there have been TWENTY-SIX EDITIONS IN EIGHTY-ONE YEARS (a new edition every 3.1 years) would give you the DISTINCT impression that these men, and their followers, who put confidence in their editions, have NO ASSURANCE WHATEVER of what ARE NOT the very and the exact GREEK WORDS OF GOD in the New Testament!"**

Answer for yourself: Did you hear that and does that sink in?

Answer for yourself: If the New Testament is to be believed to be "The Word Of God" then knowing these facts does it not stand to reason that God has done a terrible job of preserving it?

Despite the fact that Dr. Waite misses the point that if the New Testament is indeed the word of God, then God has done a miserable job preserving it, his complaint about the present day Greek text, which stands behind all modern translations, speaks volumes about the **history of New Testament corruption** and needs no further comment other than to criticize his unmitigated defense of *the Textus Receptus*, which stands behind his beloved KJV.

In his attack on men like Westcott, Hort, Nestle and Aland, whom he calls "theological heretics", Waite conveniently **forgets to mention why it was that they decided it necessary to produce a new Greek bible in the first place. He forgets to mention the sloppy methods by which the "original" Textus Receptus was produced, nor does he bother to relate the history of the biased, opinionated men or their methods which ultimately produced the KJV.** Undoubtedly Dr. Waite forgets all this because the men who produced the KJV were, as good Protestants, quite close to his own Baptist theology!

With blunt admissions like these, which are a slap in the face of the "infallibility of the New Testament" doctrine, we can see why it is that men like Dr. Waite try to warn fellow fundamentalists away from reading the works of so-called secular scholarship which expose such facts to the "believing flock".



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #8

Faced with the irrefutable truth that the history of the Protestant New Testament is one of mass of confusion, a die-hard fundamentalist, trying desperately to cling to his faith, might naturally be tempted to look at the forerunner of their New Testament, i.e., the Latin Vulgate, as a possible candidate for the "infallible" word of God. Even though such a claim is made by the Roman Catholic Church the truth is that their own history relates a different story.

Christian legend says that in the time of St. Jerome the bible then in use, which is now known as the Old Latin, was deemed to be in a mess. So hopeless was the situation that the pope himself prevailed upon the great St. Jerome to correct the situation by using the "original Greek" New Testament to produce a new translation (The New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 2, p. 441). This Jerome supposedly did. The editors of The Cambridge History of the Bible make the point essential to this study: "A natural question is: Can the 'old' Greek manuscript that Jerome used in the preparation of the Vulgate gospels be identified? The short answer is, No" (The New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 2, p. 529). However, as they point out, scholars are able to partially identify some of Jerome's work as being based on both the Alexandrian and Western families of text—which doesn't tell us a whole lot (The New Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. 2, p. 529). For instance it doesn't tell us anything about the "original" manuscripts or their origin, nor does it tell us how much of these Jerome used or indeed how many changes he made. To accept the Latin Vulgate as the "infallible word of God" one essentially has to place their faith in Jerome and equally in the numerous revisers that followed him. They also have to unquestionably accept the manuscripts behind the Vulgate.

Considering that all we really know of the Vulgate is that it is based on the Old Latin, then we need to examine this source closer, which is virtually impossible because it has an obscure origin. **The only definite fact about the Old Latin is that the surviving fragments exhibit many variations, which means that they are far from being a candidate for the "infallible" word of God.** On top of this almost all scholars seriously doubt that Jerome ever translated the entire New Testament, which tells us that the Vulgate, like the Protestant versions, is essentially nothing more than a **composite work** (The Cambridge History of the Bible, vol. I, pp. 373-374). Jerome is essentially credited with translating the four-gospels. Short and to the point, these are the facts that are conveniently forgotten while Roman Catholics denounce the heresy of Protestant bible translations!

Answer for yourself: But what about the other sources for Jerome's work? What about the Alexandrian and Western texts, which scholars have identified as partial sources for the Vulgate, and which, by the way, are also employed by scholars for modern Protestant translations?

THE GREAT CODICES

A "codice" is a manuscript volume containing the Scriptures. To further complicate matters for fundamentalist Christians the last few centuries have brought the discoveries of several so-called great Uncials, so designated

because they were written in Greek capital letters. The Uncials are the oldest known extant manuscripts of the Christian New Testament and are as follows: The Codex Alexandrinus from the fifth century AD, the Codex Sinaiticus from the fourth or early fifth centuries; The Codex Vaticanus, the oldest, from the fourth century; the Codex Ephraemi, from the fifth century and the Codex Bezae from the sixth century.

One would think that the discovery of these MSS. would be a welcomed event in Christendom, hailed as a great advancement in the study of Christian scripture. **It was not!**

Answer for yourself: Why not for Heaven's sake?

This is because the great Uncials not only disagree with the present Christian bible, they show unmistakable signs of having been heavily edited.

Imagine, the oldest known MSS. of the New Testament show disturbing evidence of having been "worked over" by Catholic monks!

And, if these facts weren't bad enough, some of the great Uncials include the ancient and so-called spurious books of the bible. For example the Codex Sinaiticus includes the Epistle of Barnabas and The Shepherd of Hermas—a fact that focuses one's attention on the infamous Christian councils and their disgraceful process of "canonizing" the New Testament, a subject that I will deal with shortly.

To completely understand why these oldest of all manuscripts are so controversial within fundamental Christianity we only need cite several examples.

In 1938 scholar T.C. Skeat examined the fourth century Codex Sinaiticus under ultra-violet light. Under the visible text he found the following verse, which had been erased: "*Consider the lilies of the field: they neither card nor spin.*" Biblical historian Robin Lane Fox writes, "the King James translators have beguiled us with a wrong version; there was growing, no toiling, in what the author wrote. Strictly, there were no 'lilies', because they are a very free translation of the Greek; however, the botanists' favorite candidate for the flower in question (a Stembergia) would spoil the flow of the saying" (Fox, The Unauthorized Version, pp. 140-141, referring to Matthew 6:28).

Another example is the story of Jesus' encounter with the woman taken in adultery. Manfred Barthel writes, "Two passages in this Gospel [John] are not included in the most reliable ancient manuscripts, and stylistic analysis confirms that they were added by another writer" (What the Bible Really Says, p. 232). Robin Lane Fox adds, "He that is without sin among you, let him first cast a stone at her"; "Neither do I condemn thee: go, and sin no more". The episode is missing from the surviving fourth-century codices which underpin the rest of the New Testament text; it is not known in an early papyrus or any quotation by an early Christian author, although the subject was relevant to so much which they discussed. Its style is universally held to differ from the rest of the fourth Gospel, and in its present place it interrupts the flow of the text" (The Unauthorized Version, p. 143).

Most Christians are unaware that there are two versions of the Acts of the Apostles. One is almost a tenth longer than the other. Again, Robin Lane Fox makes the relevant observation: "The shorter, usual text is based on one of the main Greek lines, the Alexandrian, whereas the longer alternative is best represented in a book-text, Codex Bezae, of the fifth to sixth century date which contains the Gospels and Acts in Greek and Latin. Its extra wordings and variant readings are sometimes reflected in early Christian quotations or in early papyrus fragments of Acts' text" (The Unauthorized Version, p. 141).

In just these few examples out of hundreds we can see why so many present-day ministers have denounced the great codices as corrupt—they present an embarrassing predicament. **And these are simple examples and not nearly as serious as the inclusion of pagan doctrines as put into the mouth of Jesus and others in the New Testament** [<http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>]. Essentially, what we see in the most ancient extant Greek manuscripts is the evolution, if you'll pardon the expression, of the New Testament Gospel

stories especially when compared to the present-day finished product. That this is exactly what these MSS. prove has caused no small embarrassment for countless theologians who, on more than one occasion, have said that it was unfortunate that these early MSS. survived to the present because by their contents they serve no useful purpose for the unity of the Christian faith.

Such embarrassment stands behind the following comment from Christian fundamentalist, Dr. D.A. Waite, in his book Defending the King James Bible. After relating the story about how Professor Konstantin von Tischendorf discovered the Codex Sinaiticus in a trash basket at St. Catherine's Monastery in the Sinai, and buying it for several hundred dollars, Waite quotes a Dr. James Quorllo: "I don't know which of them had the truer evaluation of its worth—Tischendorf, who wanted to buy it, or the monks, who were getting ready to burn it!" Waite adds to this comment, *"He had to pay for the trash. It really was that, because of all the heretic' changes"* (Waite, Defending The King James Bible, p. 60).

Heresy, as Dr. Waite charges, is not the only transparent argument used against the great codices. Here is an even more radical excuse, which is offered by a Christian fundamentalist church: *"The oldest extant copies [of the New Testament] are the most corrupt! . . .* The oldest fragments of the New Testament are of the 'Western Text,' used by the early Catholic Church fathers in the first three centuries. *This type of text is full of spurious additions, notable corruption's, deletions and contradictions.* These 'oldest' fragments vary so from each other that there would be no way of knowing what constitutes the New testament! This 'Western Text' admittedly originated in Rome!"

Dr. D.A. Waite echoes this opinion: "Both Dr. Frederick Scrivener and Dean John William Burgon agreed that *the greatest pollution of the stream of pure manuscripts was accomplished in the first 100 years after the New Testament was written!* So some believe that the oldest are not necessarily the best! This is especially true since the heretics had their knives out "correcting" the Greek N.T. almost as soon as it was written" (The Four-Fold Superiority of the King James Version, p. 8). Waite follows this thought in his book, Defending the King James Bible, when he writes of the oldest codices: ". . . [they] had very little, if any, use by their owners. I believe this was true because *the owners recognized them to be perverted texts,* having been defaced and polluted by heretics and others . . . they are neither the best nor the purest. They were corrupted by heretics" (p. 59). With these biased, ignorant words ringing in our ears, let's touch on a very significant point.

Christian fundamentalists laud the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls, in particular the Book of Isaiah, as incontrovertible evidence that the Old Testament is the "infallible word of God." That is to say, because the Isaiah scroll essentially agrees with the now accepted book of Isaiah, or the Masoretic text of the Christian bible, it is proof; say the fundamentalists, of Isaiah's authenticity and God's hand in its preservation. This is a fine sounding argument if it weren't for one problem: Among those same Dead Sea Scrolls is a copy of the book of Jeremiah that is more in line with the Septuagint, which is the translation behind the Old Testament of the great Uncials. This fact has caused considerable controversy within many fundamentalist Christian circles, and it may well be one of the reasons that it took some fifty years before Christian scholars were finally forced to make the Dead Sea Scrolls public.

But let us notice something: the same men who hold up the ancient example of the Dead Sea Scroll book of Isaiah as proving the authenticity of the bible, will not apply the same test to the oldest Greek MSS. of the New Testament. That is because when applied to the New Testament this comparison proves the opposite of what they are claiming, which is the doctrine of an infallible Christian bible. Hence they complain that the oldest are the most corrupt! *This claim, by the way, is an unscientific principle, especially in the field of history where the closer one comes to the original source the nearer they are to the truth. At Qumran was discovered older Hebrew texts that differed considerably in unique places from the Greek Septuagint and which also predated it by some 1000 years. This is of importance because they also basically agreed with the oldest existing (up to then) Hebrew texts of 900-1000 A.D. These older Hebrew texts had differed also considerably with the Greek LXX and were basically discounted by Christianity as*

the more authentic because of their age as well as their "theological diversity" when compared with the LXX. But with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls the Jewish Palestinian Masoretic text was exonerated and now the question as to "theological diversity" falls squarely upon the Greek Septuagint which now appears to have altered in no small way the "theology" concerning atonement and the Jewish Messiah. Basically Christianity has been turned upside down with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls (see <http://bennoah1.freewebsites.com>).

Perhaps the irony of the whole situation is that if the great Uncials had been in complete agreement with the present-day Christian bible, their discovery would have been hailed as one of the greatest events in Christian history! Indeed, most Christian fundamentalists blatantly display their hypocrisy in this regard by their consistent use of the earliest known fragments of the New Testament as proof of the New Testament's authenticity. In other words because of their age (the earliest dating from the second century AD) these fragments are lauded as proof that the New Testament was written by the men to whom later church fathers assigned authorship. However, what is conveniently forgotten is that these early fragments, like the great Uncials, are from the so-called Alexandrian and Western texts, meaning that they often disagree with the present-day Byzantine Text-based New Testament.

Even more to the point is that when compared one to another, these fragments are full of contradictions. First of all there are only some eighty eight pieces that date before AD 300, with only a few dating before AD 180. As to their conflicting readings we only need cite the example of two early papyri from the Gospel of John. They overlap across seventy verses and, as Robin Lane Fox notes, "even if the plain errors of their copyists are excluded, they differ at no less than seventy small places (Fox, The Unauthorized Version, p. 139).

However, none of the above information seems to deter the intellectually dishonest. Even with the history of the New Testament squarely in front of them they still make statements like this: "None of the modern [NT] scholars have thought to look at the bulk of later New Testament Manuscripts —95% of known Greek Biblical MSS. [i.e., the Byzantine Texts]—which the Greek people and its church have always used! These later MSS., copied century after century from earlier ones as they wore out, are the fundamental basis of the King James Version (KJV)."

As we have seen from the information already presented the author of this statement is being completely dishonest. Scholars have indeed "thought to look at the bulk of later New Testament Manuscripts", which is why there is such great confusion among the many different New Testament translations. Further, the manuscripts that the "Greek people and its church have always used" date back only to the seventh century AD, with complete texts preserved about 200 years later than this time. The author compounds this misinformation with the following: "The nearly 4,000 MSS. of this Byzantine or Official Text agree so perfectly with each other that the only work of the critic is to weed out individual scribal mistakes in the copying of each Ms. The text is not in question!" The author of the above never bothered to give any sources for his statements, which was wise considering the evidence would expose his dishonesty. Yet, I for one, as a former dedicated "the bible is the infallible word of God" advocate, would never have questioned such statements in the past. I would have read this statement in total agreement! Why? Because my fundamentalist background and natural life-long bias in favor of Christianity would lead me to accept without question such an argument—just like a born-Buddhist would accept the fundamentals of his faith without question. The fact is that like 99.99% of all Christians, I had never bothered to research the history of the New Testament. I was born into a Christian fundamentalist family, had grown up believing in New Testament infallibility, and that was good enough for me. My past attitude can be summed up in the little fundamentalist ditty so often quoted: *"the bible says it, I believe it, and that settles it!"*

What I sadly found out upon serious investigation is that nothing could be further from the truth, and because of believing such lies of biased non-Jews I lived the vast majority of my life opposing the God I loved both in doctrine and conduct because I had believed "in the New Testament" and patterned my life and thoughts after it. Thank God in Heaven that my eyes were opened to the beautiful

truth of Biblical Judaism; the faith of Yeshua. More in the next article.



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #9

Most scholars agree that the language of Jesus and his disciples was Aramaic, which means that they never would have written a New Testament in Greek. Further these same scholars note that the sayings of Jesus, as found in the four Gospels, bear traces of having been originally translated from Aramaic into Greek. The Jerome Biblical Commentary tells us: ". . . the words of Jesus, as recorded in the Gospels, definitely show Ara[maic] influence.... Since Aramaisms are strongest and most frequent in the words of Jesus, an Aram[aic] saying-source, either written or oral, underlies the Synoptic Gospel tradition'" (Vol. II, pp. 11-12)

THE ALEXANDRIAN INFLUENCE UPON YOUR NEW TESTAMENT

First of all you need to know that the hot-bed of religious scholarship in the first century was Alexandria, Egypt. It was the melting pot for all world religions and provides fertile soil for all religions to mix and exchange views. So we find in Alexandria a little of everything as far as religions myths and stories.

Next you need to know that there is a distinction between the Gospels stories of Jesus' life and the actual quoted sayings of Jesus. This needs to be kept in mind. In other words, while most scholars agree that the most primitive "New Testament" consisted only of the sayings of Jesus, which were likely composed in, or translated from Aramaic, they note that the actual stories surrounding Jesus' life and death, as found in Gospels, were most assuredly composed in Greek. This betrays the Alexandrian influence upon the accounts recorded within the New Testament which are taken from pagan mystery religions and written into the life of Jesus. Such is the Alexandrian influence.

What I say now is at the crux of the problems revealed so far. Scholars, being virtually unanimous that the New Testament was composed in Greek, while at the same time incorporating the Aramaic sayings of Jesus, offer compelling evidence for the accusations **that it was later Greek-speaking church fathers who composed the New Testament as we know it.** Until the Christian church realizes this truth there may be no hope for her education into the corruptness of the New Testament. The true Apostles did not write the Gospels and many of the supposed letters of Paul were never penned by him. Biblical criticism whereby internal evidences are scrutinized reveals such details.

Evidence for the demonstration that it was the Greek-speaking church fathers who composed the New Testament and not the Jewish followers of Yeshua is seen easily in 3 facts:

- **Within the New Testament and written into the life of a Jewish Rabbi is something totally foreign to him as well as the Old Testament and his faith; namely the integrated pagan legends of a virgin-born, crucified sun-god in the Gospel stories which were drawn from the existing mystery religions of such Greeks.**
- **The accusation is also backed by the admission that the quotations or allusions to the Old Testament found in the New Testament depend upon the Greek Septuagint and not the**

- Masoretic Text which the Jews rejected because of its corruptions at the hands of its Greek translators. The Septuagint was the Old Testament version used by the early church fathers, but would have been deemed unworthy of use by a first century Orthodox Jew like Jesus.**
- The existence of the earliest Gospel ever found, the Gnostic Gospel According To Thomas.**

As if that was not enough, the scholarly contention that the original New Testament contained only the sayings of Jesus was given a tremendous boost by the discovery in Egypt in 1947 of the **Nag Hammadi manuscripts**, specifically a gospel account now known as The Gospel According To Thomas. The entire manuscript was written in Coptic and dates to ca. AD 350, while some portions, in Greek, date to ca. AD 140. Actually, the entire MSS. is but a translation of a second century original composed in Greek. This gospel, in certain respects, is actually the oldest known complete MSS. of the NT in existence. But, significantly, it is a Gnostic Christian production containing only the sayings of Jesus and therefore rejected by orthodox Christians. More than likely the main reason why The Gospel According To Thomas is rejected by Christianity is that if they admit that these sayings of Jesus were indeed all there was to the original gospels, then there is a very big problem with the modern four Gospels, because there is much more than the sayings in the accounts of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John! **Added to that one's knowledge of Aryan-Sun Myths and their crucified saviors and sun-gods, along with the stories comprising their lives which date up to thousands of years before Jesus, then it is hard for an objective reader of the New Testament to find a story about the life of Jesus in the New Testament which has not been told previously multiple times over about these pagan gods** (<http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>)

Answer for yourself: Are you a thinking believer?

Answer for yourself: Are you an objective believer who wants the facts and the truth at all costs?

CAN YOU HANDLE THE TRUTH?

To the thinking believer there is only one conclusion to which one can arrive: The New Testament is a woven tale by non-Jews who patterned this "Jesus" which was preached to them after their own pagan g-ds and only changed the names of them thereby conforming "this Jesus" in the image of their pagan g-ds and their pagan religions. The results of such efforts is the New Testament which is a collection of articles which betray such plagiarism. But one must have the knowledge before hand if one is to see and recognize such alarming perversions as applied to the Historical Jesus.

The editors of **The Complete Gospels** explain that, "The frequent word-for-word agreements between Matthew and Luke are impossible to account for if both were independently translating from Aramaic (p. 250).

These facts along with corrupt church history and the confused state of both the Protestant and Catholic so-called original Greek New Testaments, have caused a few scholars to claim that the whole of the New Testament was originally written in Aramaic. Although on the surface this argument seems logical history itself doesn't support the claim.

THE PESHITTA TEXT....THE ARAMIC BIBLE

There is a New Testament translation that has been promoted by many as the only reliable text because it is allegedly a translation from the original Aramaic writings of Jesus' apostles. The translation, known as the Peshitta, which means the "simple version," purports to have been copied, century after century from the original Aramaic manuscripts—**which notably are conveniently missing**. The Peshitta is reproduced in English in the Lamsa translation. There are a number of flaws in this claim. First of all, history tells us that the earliest version of what came to be called the Peshitta, known as the Old Syriac, contained only the four Gospels and not the entire New Testament. Although those who promote the Peshitta somehow date this work to ca AD 160, the second problem is that the only "original" of the work survives in quotations found in later writings.

The fact is that the earliest surviving manuscripts of the Peshitta date only from the fourth and fifth centuries. They are The Sinai Palimpsest (Sinaiticus) and Cureton's MSS., which is called the Curetonianus. But scholars point out that these MSS. are really of little value because they were made from an early Greek text with many "Western features," which is to say the Western texts used by the early Roman Christian Church. To throw a further "wrench into the works" the editors of The Oxford Companion to the Bible tell us that the Greek text in question was itself revised "on the basis of an early form of the Koine, or Byzantine Greek NT Text; this revision, eventually called the Peshitta, emerged in ca 400 AD to become the standard New Testament of the Syriac Churches" (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 754)

In other words the "original" texts of the Peshitta did not originate from the first century Aramaic-speaking apostles, but came from both early Western and Byzantine Greek texts, which we have been discussing throughout this study.

To completely understand the composition of the Peshitta let's look a little closer at its pre-history, meaning the works that formed its foundation. They include a so-called harmony of the Gospels called the Diatessaron. According to the church father Eusebius the compiler of the Diatessaron was a man named Tatian who was a native of Mesopotamia and a disciple of Justin Martyr, meaning that he received his Christian education and training via the Church of Rome. In other words it is a Catholic production. This is made even more clear since Tatian is said to have originally composed the Diatessaron in Latin (The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church, p. 296). Biblical historians also tell us that this **Tatian changed the text of the Gospels during his translation work to support his extreme hostility to sex.** Despite this open tampering, Tatian's work was widely accepted in the Eastern Christian Churches where it made a serious impact on Christian scholarship (Fox, The Unauthorized Version, pp. 139-140). It was in the Eastern Churches, remember, that the Byzantine texts originated.

All of this takes us to the Greek MSS. behind the Peshitta. Regarding these, we read the following in The Encyclopedia Britannica: "The MSS. differ considerably in reading, and each has certainly been influenced by the Diatessaron [of Tatian...Catholic theologically influenced], so that in Syriac-speaking lands about AD 400 the Gospel was extant as a Harmony and as 'separated Gospels,' . . . the single copies having **many discordant readings**, just as had been the case in Latin before Jerome. To remedy this, Rabbula, bishop of Edessa from 411 to 435, prepared a revised edition of the 'Separated Gospels,' **freely correcting the text from Greek mss.** such as were then current at Antioch: this edition he established by authority and suppressed the Diatessaron with such success that no Syriac copy of the Diatessaron survives, and of the unrevised version only Syr. S and C. Rabbula's revision is now used by both the great divisions of the Syriac-speaking Church: to distinguish it from the elaborate later revision of the (Jacobite) Old and New Testament it is usually called Peshitta, i.e. the simple version." The editor's conclusion is that, "The Peshitta has only the value of a post-Nicene revision (14th ed., vol. 3, p. 517).

The long and the short of it is that the so-called Peshitta is nothing more than its rival translations—a book produced by questionable men inside a notoriously corrupt church, all of which does little for the "infallibility of the bible" argument!

Now on to the last article in this series.



WHAT YOUR CHURCH AND PASTOR NEVER TOLD YOU ABOUT THE NEW TESTAMENT #10

So far the case for a divinely-inspired original Greek New Testament has been lacking. Let's see if this can't be helped along by closing our study with the examination of another related event, which is the canonization of the New Testament.

"Canon" is a word describing the much-fought-over, officially accepted books of the Christian Churches which comprise their holy bible. "Canonization" is the term used to describe the process by which these books became canon. To the untrained ear it all sounds very scholarly and religious. But to those familiar with ancient church history what canonization really means is that the pious liars, cheats, perverts and murderers who comprised the hierarchy of the early Christian Church were the ones who decided irrevocably what books of the New Testament were sacred and what books were to be discarded.

In other word if you carry a New Testament you have the summary of Catholic Theology at its highest and you might as well go to mass.

If this critical assessment seems a bit harsh it is probably because the average Christian has little if any knowledge of the early history of their church or their Bible. Take for example this blunt admission from the Roman Catholic Church about the character of the church fathers of the fourth century: "The primitive disciplined charity of the early Christians had been diluted by self-willed scholars, ambitious politicians, and easy-going laxists" (Knights of Columbus, The Catholic Pilgrimage, p. 4).

What is important in this study is that it was in the fourth century AD that the final New Testament canon was decided for the entire Christian Church! (The Encyclopedia Britannica 14th edition, vol. 3, p. 514). Not a very reassuring thought when one considers, as historian Michael Grant notes, it was a time in which men "crept into the church to secure its benefits", (Grant, Constantine the Great, p. 161) and doubly ominous when we consider that it was during this time that the present-day, much-worked-over, surviving New Testament MSS. were produced.

Perhaps even more revealing is that the church fathers of the fourth century were not only politically and morally corrupt, in many cases they were not even interested in Christianity. That the bishop of Troy was known to pray to the sun-god at the same time he was holding Episcopal office, is only one example of the kind of church fathers one deals with in early church history (Grant, Constantine the Great, p. 136). Another good example is found in the famous fourth century Council of Nicaea and the man responsible for its organization.

A CRITICAL LOOK AT CONSTANTINE...SHOULD WE FOLLOW HIS COUNCIL AND THEIR THEOLOGY?

As noted at the beginning of this study the man who promoted Christianity into a world-class religion was the so-called first Christian emperor, Constantine the Great. However, for the sake of considering New Testament

origins, let's note a few examples of his Christianity. For instance, long after his alleged conversion Constantine continued his devotion to pagan g-ds. In one case he removed the great Palladium (the large stone phallus or penis of the sun-god) from Rome to Constantinople, his capital city, and set it up as a symbol of his own masculinity. On top of this image he placed a statue of himself in the guise of the sun-g-d Apollo, to which his faithful subjects were commanded to bow and worship (Walker, The Woman's Encyclopedia of Myths and Secrets, p. 764).

The editors of The Encyclopedia Britannica say of Constantine that, "He was at best only half heathen, half Christian, who could seek to combine the worship of Christ with the worship of Apollo, having the name of one and the figure of the other impressed upon his coins, and ordaining the observance of Sunday [i.e., the day sacred to the sun-g-d] under the name Dies Solis (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th edition, Volume VI, p. 301). Apollo and Mithra were one and the same g-d from two different places, i.e., Greece and Persia, both being mingled in later Roman worship. For those who don't know it, it was at this time that Sunday officially replaced the seventh-day Sabbath within the Christian Church.

As a further example of his lack Christian ethic, historians note that Constantine was guilty of murdering his own son and wife, among countless others. A notorious example of this can be seen in the following. Long after his "Christian" conversion Constantine fell ill and ordered that a large number of children be killed so he could bathe in their blood, and thus effect a magical cure. He was only dissuaded when a group of Christian parents pleaded for mercy (Grant, Constantine the Great, p. 175). Most revealing is that Constantine was not even baptized into the church until he lay on his death bed. On 22 May 337 water was poured on his forehead and the "first Christian emperor" was pronounced saved in the name of the Father, the Son and the Holy Spirit (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 9th edition, Volume VI, p. 301).

However, Constantine's lack of Christianity mattered little to the church notables who gathered for the emperor's great council on May 20, AD 325, at Nicaea. This is because Constantine had long since bought their loyalty, giving away such wealth that the Christian clergy was among the greatest land owners in the empire, often living on palatial estates reviling even the wealthiest subjects. "whose at court dined with Constantine—like Apostles surrounding Christ in paradise," wrote Constantine's official biographer, the church father Eusebius. Historian Michael Grant adds, "...churches became endowed with great wealth, Christian art and architecture increasingly showed the grandeur of imperial ceremonial" (Grant, Constantine the Great, p. 160). But wealth wasn't the only bribery used by Constantine to gain loyalty.

As an added assurance that his will became law in the church, Constantine also relied on the fear that he had instilled in virtually everyone in the empire. Whether this fear came from the thought of losing their wealth or from falling prey to the routine executions ordered by the emperor doesn't matter. What does matter is that within the church Constantine's control was so complete that it was referred to as *Caesaropapism* (Grant, Constantine the Great, p. 159-161). Also important to this study is that it was this man who called the famous Council of Nicaea, whose purpose was to decide some fundamental church doctrines.

Take time to let what you now know of Constantine sink in and then ask yourself if the doctrines decided basically by this man for all of Christianity today should be "believed"?

Moreover, it was Constantine who set the agenda and it was he who issued the final statements of decision. And just in case there should be any open dissension, Constantine also let it be publicly known that he would personally deal with those who did not conform to his wishes. Indeed after the Council of Nicaea, when Constantine's decisions had been forced upon the church, Eusebius wrote to the emperor: "We committed an impious act, O prince, by subscribing to a blasphemy from fear of you" (Smith, Constantine the Great, p. 202).

Answer for yourself: How does that make you feel when Constantine's right-hand man tells him after the Council of Nicaea that "they" had "committed an impious act"...likening it to "blasphemy" because "they feared Constantine"?

Answer for yourself: Are you aware that Nicaea rejected the faith of Yeshua as it had spread into all the world up to that time and gave you instead Constantine's paganism with Jesus' name attached?

Answer for yourself: Can you now understand why Bet Emet Ministries is a voice crying in a desert of Biblical ignorance in America today?

THE LEGACY OF CONSTANTINE LIVES ON IN OTHER COUNCILS

Such bullying tactics set the stage for later councils, notably the Council of Ephesus held in AD 449, which erupted into bloodshed. When one group of delegates could not get their way, they went after the other side with clubs, until after the battle, they had enforced their decrees on the Christian Church. As one historian wrote: "Fanatical bands of monks terrorized the assembly of Church notables (Nigg, The Heretics, P. 121). To be fair, these actions were not unheard of. Indeed, bloodshed had long been an established way of doing business within the Christian Church, going back as far as Pope Damascus, who murdered 137 priests and other followers of his rival to gain the papacy. The situation surrounding the Councils of Nicaea and Ephesus was by no means unique (DeRose, The Vicars of Christ, p. 38).

Another prime example of the character of the early church fathers is found in the famous **Bishop Eusebius, who attended the Council of Nicaea and who is rightly considered as one of Christianity's greatest liars.** It is commonly admitted that he forged a writing known as the Lepers, which were supposedly an exchange between Abgar and Jesus. He falsely declared that he had found the originals and gives a translation of them in his Ecclesiastical History (Wheless, Forgery in Christianity, p. 155). That such an episode was by no means unique to Eusebius comments volumes on the integrity of the early church fathers and the canonization of the New Testament!

It should also give us pause for serious concern when we consider that not only did the earliest complete MSS. of the New Testament surface during this time, as well as the absorption of numerous pagan doctrines, customs and deities into the Christian faith, but it was from this time and among these particular church fathers that the twenty-seven books of the New Testament were selected and officially canonized as holy scripture.

How that came about is briefly, and with a certain amount of gloss, summed up in the following account from a correspondence course lesson offered by a fundamentalist Christian college: "Prior to the fourth century there was no [official] catalogue of the New Testament canonical books. However, even during the time of the apostles, quotations of some of these books were made by writers of the Christian faith.... Clement, Paul's fellow laborer, referred to 1 Corinthians as 'Paul's epistle.' . . . Tertullian (AD 160-220) regarded the four Gospels and most of the books of the New Testament to be genuine.

Eusebius of Caesarea [circa AD 260-340 and the same man mentioned above in the forgery scandal] declared in his Ecclesiastical History (AD 315) that it was, ".... universally admitted that the four Gospels, Acts, the Epistles of Paul, the first Epistles of John, Peter, and Revelation are genuine.... Jerome's residence in Palestine and great knowledge of the sites of bible history qualifies him to make statements as to the authenticity of the books of the New Testament Scriptures. **He [the church father Jerome] assigned authorship of the books to the person whose name the book carried.** He assigned the Acts of the Apostles to Luke, and the Epistles of the Hebrews to Paul, noting that there was some doubt as to authorship of this epistle which today is considered anonymous" (Zion Faith College, lesson no. 1, pp. 3-4).

Answer for yourself: Did you notice for yourself that even Christian Colleges sometimes teach the truth when they tell you that the Apostles did not write the Gospels?

As to these reliability of men like Eusebius, Clement, Tertullian and Jerome on the matter of New Testament authorship, we can ignore the questions about their character and merely note that in this instance **they are only repeating tradition, which we now knew wasn't reliable because modern critical analysis**

confirms that many hands played a part in the composition of each New Testament book.

Regarding the canon itself history tells us that the first known canon was put together by the so-called great heretic, Marcion, in circa AD 150. What is of significance here is that, as Salomon Reinach, notes, "Down to this time all quotations from 'Scriptures' in the works of the Apostolic Fathers, refer exclusively to the Old Testament" (Reinach, Salomon, Orpheus. (New York: Horace Liverlight Inc., 1930), p. 229. In other words, until AD 150 and the time of Marcion the church fathers either didn't know of any "New Testament" manuscripts, or if they did, they seriously doubted their authenticity.

Answer for yourself: So what does that say about the Gospels being written by the Apostles? It tells us the Gospels were the creation of non-Apostles much later after the deaths of the Apostles.

At any rate it was Marcion who collected various books of what would one day be the New Testament—another significant point because Marcion, being notoriously anti-Jewish, deliberately excluded the Old Testament from his teachings. Indeed he even went so far as to purge the writings of Paul and what we now call the Gospel of Luke of what he considered Jewish traits' (Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, book II, p. 207). But despite his obvious lack of Christian character, we find this positive statement about Marcion in The New International Dictionary of the Christian Church: "The significance of Marcion lies in the fact that he compelled representatives of orthodox Christianity to deal seriously with the problems of evil, to think deeply about the biblical teaching concerning creation and redemption, to reexamine the Pauline writings, and to decide upon the question of the canon" (Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, book II, p. 207).

Relevant to both the question of the canon and Marcion's role in the matter, let's quote biblical historian Robin Lane Fox here about Marcion's tampering with the NT books: "In the 140's an important Christian, Marcion, troubled many of his fellow Christians by producing a 'Gospel' which abbreviated Luke's so as to suit his theology . . . He edited ten letters of Paul, changing and omitting bits which he did not like and also omitted the Epistles to Timothy and Titus. This enterprise played havoc with the written text." Fox astutely comments: "If Christian texts were being changed and edited to this degree, even a gap of a century between the original and its first survival on a papyrus is a long and potentially dangerous time. We simply do not know what may have happened to the author's words at important places." (Legge, Forerunners and Rivals of Christianity, book II, p. 139-140).

In all fairness it should be mentioned that Marcion wasn't the only early Christian notable who tampered with the New Testament. In an open attempt to write the doctrine of the Trinity into the pages of the New Testament Apollinaris the Elder, and his son Apollinaris the Younger, rewrote the New Testament using Platonic theology" (Encyclopedia Britannica, 11th edition, Volume 2. P. 183). Athanasius is thought by historians to have been Apollinarian, so called from Apollinarius "the younger," who rewrote the New Testament with his father in the platonic dialogues, in an effort to combat those in the Christian Church who taught against the Trinity (The Encyclopedia Britannica, 14th ed., Volume 2, pp. 109, 600). Now pay attention to what I say next and imagine the implications. The significant point here is that a disciple of the two Apollinaris' was a man named Athanasius who was the first to mention all twenty-seven books of the present New Testament in the famous Thirty-ninth Paschal Letter of Athanasius (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 103).

The Encyclopedia Britannica tells us the following:

"The triumph of the Athanasian Canon, indeed, went along with the triumph of Nicene Christianity. And while the movement received its impulse from Athanasius, the power by which it was carried through and established was largely that of his powerful ally the Church of Rome (11th ed., Vol. 3, pp. 876-877). As In the Western Church the canon of Athanasius was likely approved at the synod of Rome in AD 382, being definitely confirmed in 405 by papal declaration. In other words the present

New Testament canon was produced inside the Roman Catholic Church and approved by a Roman Catholic pope, which is only natural as Roman Catholicism and early Christianity was one and the same thing! (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, pp. 103-104).

Here is a partial list of the different books that were floating around the Christian world and seriously considered by the early church councils for inclusion in the canon: A gospel written by Jesus' own hand; letters and other correspondences written by Jesus; letters written by the virgin Mary; Pilate's official report to the emperor of the trial and crucifixion of Jesus, with Pilate's confession of faith; the reply to this from Tiberius; the trial of Pilate; official documents of the Roman Senate about Jesus, Gospels, epistles, acts, by every single one of the twelve apostles; and official documents of church law and government, written in Greek by the apostles. the number comes to about 50 or more "holy" books (Wheless, Forgery in Christianity, p. 101; also The Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume VI, p. 656).

As to the Gospels themselves, out of which only four were finally selected and canonized, at one time there were some 200 different ones circulating in the Christian Church. As late as 450, Bishop Theodore of Cyrrhus said there were at least 200 different Gospels revered by the churches of his own diocese, until he destroyed all but the canonical four" (Walker, The Woman's Encyclopedia, p. 467). Here are some of the known (or at least the surviving) Gospels, which, keep in mind, were at different times and in different places accepted as the "infallible word" of God by the faithful of Christ: The Gospels of Mark, Matthew, Luke, John, the Gospel of Signs, the Gospel of Thomas, Greek Fragments of Thomas, Secret Book of James, Dialogue of the Savior, Gospel of Mary, Infancy Gospel of I homes, Infancy Gospel of James, Gospel of Peter, Secret Gospel of Mark, Egerton Gospel, Gospel Oxyrhynchus, Gospel of the Hebrews, Gospel of the Ebionites and the Gospel of the Nazoreans.

Essentially, Christian history proves one thing: it is only by faith in the early church fathers that present day Christians can accept the canonized New Testament as the word of God.

CONCLUSION

Although the average Christian can easily repeat some well-rehearsed Jesus legend, or quote one or two favorite passages, they will look at you with a blank stare if you should mention any of the facts related in this study. That is because, to say this one more time, most Protestant and Catholic ministers have deliberately kept their congregations in ignorance of the true history of their church. My only hope is that you, the reader, will take what is written here and go to the nearest library to seek out the books of scholars, both Christian and secular, and use your logic and common sense to make a final determination.

Answer for yourself: Given the history of the New Testament as I have labored to show you, my closing question to you, the reader, is "which part of your New Testament is infallible, inerrant, and inspired and worthy to be followed by you for your faith and practice as you attempt to please God with your life?"

Answer for yourself: Which parts of the New Testament are blatant attempts to lead the reader from what Jesus both believed and practiced and what Rome wanted instead?

Answer for yourself: What part of your faith, as inherited from New Testament beliefs, is before God truthful and which is not; and do you know how to spot the lies from the truths when you read the New Testament?

Answer for yourself: Do you want to learn how? Well, Bet Emet is for you then because we will share with you, as we have done here in this series of articles, the hard facts and truth withheld from you whereby you can make an intelligent decision about your faith before God. It is our hope and prayer that armed with these facts you life can be lived more pleasing to God and when you pass into the next world you won't have to stand ashamed before the Creator of the Universe because you have been led by your Church and your Pastor to "believe in the wrong Gospel". Shalom

For further studies in the New Testament and it's canonization I suggest that you go here:

<http://www.geocities.com/faithofyeshua>



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE TRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES INTO GREEK...THE TRUTH ABOUT THE BACKGROUND OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

In order to come to an accurate understanding of the value and authority of the New Testament for the Christian believer today many things need to be understood; most of which few Christians have ever concerned themselves with. Your research must begin at the origin of the New Testament and that, believe it or not, begins long before it was written.

WHICH OLD TESTAMENT ARE WE TO HONOR AND USE?

Within the New Testament are hundreds of quotes taken from the Old Testament. The problem is which Old Testament are we to believe because there is in reality are two every different translations of the Jewish Scriptures. The Jews today have one and the Christians have one. They are not the same! The Jewish Old Testament is called the Palestinian Jewish Scriptures or the Masoretic text. Christianity has their Old Testament as taken from the Greek translation, or should I say "a purposeful mistranslation" of the Hebrew Scriptures. The translators of the Jewish Scriptures altered them terribly and wrote their sect's beliefs within it in the form of prophecies giving authority to their sect's beliefs. That is right, there are two very different Old Testaments today and the vast majority of Christians have never heard about this. Most of you never knew that. There was a time I did not as well. What I will show you in the beginning of our study is the truth and facts concerning the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into Greek and how pagan concepts were purposefully mingled within in by the Alexandrian translators and later these concepts concerning pagan sun-g-dmen were applied to Jesus by the apocalyptic messianic believers of the first century following the crucifixion of Jesus. We ended up with the conservative Pharisees looking for a Davidic Messiah or the return of Jesus to fulfill that mode; opposite this we had the Pythagorean-Buddhist Essenes who believed in a cosmic g-dman as their "anointed redeemer." These concepts were later mixed together and applied to Jesus and today we read them again mingled together in the New Testament never knowing that they were originally two conflicting and contradicting concepts; one Biblical and one Extra-Biblical. Dear ones, there is a big difference between legend and fact. The selection of which Old Testament you read and believe is of monumental importance for the Christian faith. One leads the reader down the path of righteousness and the other the path of idolatry.

The vast majority of Christian believers never even considered that their Old Testaments in their Christian Bible could possibly contain falsifications and purposeful mistranslations of the Jewish Masoretic text made over 2200 years ago which were made to further the theological agenda of the Greek-Jews of Alexandria, Egypt. If you were like me once you took it for granted when you bought your first Bible that you had the "Word of God." Well, yes and no. It never entered your mind that you might be reading religious passages that were never read by Jesus when reading the Old Testament. You simply took it for granted that you were buying the same Bible that Jesus used. If you bought a Christian Bible instead of a Jewish Tanakh nothing could have been further from the truth for you. Jesus would not use the Old Testament that is used by Christians today

because the quotes taken from there and used in the New Testament about the "messiah" are adulterated and corrupted in most places when compared to the Hebrew Masoretic text. So by default the New Testament, in quoting much of the Old Testament prophecies as taken from the Christian Old Testament are incorrect and misrepresent the historical Jesus.

What we will examine first is the corruption of the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures when they were translated by the Greek-Jews of Alexandria, Egypt, over 200 years before the birth of Jesus. The importance for you to understand in this study is that the New Testament contains hundreds of quotes from this Greek Old Testament, and if it can be proven that this Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures contain purposeful mistranslations, misquotations, and scriptures continually taken out of context from the original documents used in the translation in order to promote the religious beliefs of the translators in Alexandria, Egypt, then that means that "these quotes" as as taken from this forged Old Testament translation as found in the New Testament distorts the truth about Jesus and recasts him in the image of pagan g-dmen. This is a very serious charge and one not made lightly. **The reason I and others can bring such a charge against the New Testament is that we have done the research over years that proved beyond any shadow of doubt these tragic facts. That is why I had to leave the pastorate after several years of such study; I was wrong and preaching lies. The Jews were right; their Jewish Scriptures are the ONLY Holy Word of God we have!** The time to learn and repent is now in hope before we die we can return to the faith once given to the saints; the true faith of Jesus (Yeshua). Such would be a honor to both Jesus and the God you love. Let us begin by letting us prove this to yourself beyond any doubt. It will require some reading but the trip is worth the price.

SEPTUAGINT STUDIES

The Jewish Scriptures were translated from the Hebrew into the Greek language in Alexandria, Egypt. We must begin our study here as we attempt to familiarize ourselves with the religious climate of the day and the influences at work which played a huge part on the translations and corruption of the Jewish Scriptures. It will be this fraudulent Greek translation of the Old Testament which will sever as the Bible for the Western World let alone the substrate for the quotations in the New Testament. If it can be shown, and it can, that this was a faulty translation to say the least, then the impact upon the New Testament is devastating.

[THE ALEXANDRIAN INFLUENCE UPON EARLY CHRISTIANITY](#)

[THE ESSENE INFLUENCE AT ALEXANDRIA ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE OLD TESTAMENT INTO GREEK](#)

[WHAT SCHOLARS HAVE SAID CONCERNING THE TRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES AND THE PRODUCTION OF THE GREEK OLD TESTAMENT](#)

[AN HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE SEPTUAGINT AS TAKEN FROM ITS OWN INTRODUCTION](#)

[WHAT IS THE MASORETIC TEXT...AND IS IT FAITHFULLY REPRODUCED IN THE CHRISTIAN BIBLE?](#)

[DID THE RABBIS TRANSLATE ONLY THE FIRST FIVE BOOKS OF MOSES INTO GREEK?](#)

[THE "SEPTUAGINT" TRANSLATION INTO GREEK](#)

[THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE](#)

[THE TRUTH ABOUT WHAT WAS FOUND AT QUMRAN](#)

[THE MASORETIC TEXT AND THE GREEK SEPTUAGINT...WHAT IS OF GOD?](#)

THE ESSENES AND THEIR INFLUENCE BEHIND THE NEW TESTAMENT



bennoah1@airmail.net



THE SCHOLARS SPEAK...HAVE YOU HEARD THEM?

Again we need to think and answer some questions before we proceed:

- 1. What is the truth?**
- 2. Who has the truth? Is it your Pastor or televangelist? Could it possibly be the scholar?**
- 3. Is the truth what we usually hear in our churches and over television or read today in the "top ten" of our corner Christian book store, or could the truth be buried in archeology, history, and antiquity and few today know of it today?**
- 4. Are the popular accounts and superficial rhetoric heard today by those today who never knew, investigated, or studied in-depth such fields as archeology, biblical history, biblical linguistics, and antiquity to be considered more trustworthy than the actual examination of the earliest documents first hand and those who originally wrote the documents and were closer to the events at hand than contemporary commentators?**
- 5. Is it possible that those who lived in the earliest times and who wrote about the events of antiquity be closer to the truth than those, say, 2000 years later who wrote of the same events with denominational biases?**
- 6. Does the testimony of the earliest Church Fathers, when read, often incriminate themselves and their biases concerning the deceptions used in the formation of the New Testament Canon?**

Too many times our religious knowledge today, take the New Testament for example, concerning spiritual matters is limited to our generation and our generation only. We seem to forget that the "top ten" at your corner Christian Book store pails in comparison to a scholarly book. Too much denominational bias and "party line" occupy the bookshelves today. Most Christians I know have never read a scholarly Biblical book in their life, but yet to listen to them, they have all truth because the Holy Spirit led them to it. This always amuses me when the same Holy Spirit has evidently led almost 1 billion people to the worship of Mary as well.

Over the years of intense study I have seen first-hand how that we have lost more knowledge than we currently

possess. Even in Seminary I was beginning to get the "drift" that all is not what it is made out to be thanks to credible and honest professors who walked a thin line between their "paychecks" and truth.

Those who consider themselves "knowledgeable" today concerning the Christian religion seldom seem to know more than rhetoric or their "denominational company line." **Antiquity possesses the truths we look for if we would only look; for much it has to say is a blatant contradiction to what we have been taught today.** Our complacency and our laziness to search out these matters to see if we have been taught the truth has robbed us of this precious commodity.

The idea of a complete and clear-cut canon of the New Testament existing from the beginning, that is from Apostolic times, has no foundation in history. The Canon of the New Testament, like that of the Old, is the result of a development, of a process at once stimulated by disputes with doubters, both within and without the Church, and retarded by certain obscurities and natural hesitations, and which did not reach its final term until the dogmatic definition of the Tridentine Council. New Testament

DISTURBING QUOTES FROM SCHOLARS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

The following I provide to provoke your thinking. These men saw severe problems with the Canon and New Testament which most likely you, the reader, has not seen yet. Again, your inability to see these problems does not negate their existence. It is our hope at Bet Emet that once reading these quotes you will awaken to the personal need of serious study into the document you have accepted "by faith" without verification.

"In the Twentieth Century it is astounding to hear Christian people declare that the Bible and particularly the New Testament , says so-and-so, and that therefore it must be true. Do they not understand that the New Testament is a collection of books of varying credibility only in the Fourth Century A.D., by clergy having the limited mentality of that very uncritical age?" (Authur Weigall, The Paganism in Our Christianity, G. P. Putnam's Sons, New York, 1928, p. 34).

"The Scriptures were in the hands of the clergy only, and they had every opportunity to insert whatsoever they pleased; thus we find them (New Testament) full of interpolations. Johann Solomo Semler, one of the most influential theologians of the eighteenth century, speaking of this, says: " The Christian doctors never brought their sacred books before the common people; although people in general have been wont to think otherwise; during the first ages, they were in the hands of the clergy only" (Robert Taylor, Diegesis, p. 48).

"All the earliest external evidences points to the conclusion that thy synoptic gospels are non-apostolic digesis of spoken and written apostolic tradition, and that the arrangement of the earlier material in orderly form took place only gradually and by many essays..." (T. W. Doane, Bible Myth And Their Parallels In Other Religions, The Truth Seeker Co., New York, 1882, p. 463.).

"Dr. Hooykaas, speaking of the four 'Gospels,' and 'Acts,' says of them: 'Not one of these five books was written by the person whose name it bears, and they are all of more recent date than the heading would lead us to suppose'" (T. W. Doane, Bible Myth And Their Parallels In Other Religions, The Truth Seeker Co., New York, 1882, p. 463.).

"We cannot say that the 'Gospels' and the book of 'Acts' are unauthentic, for not one of them professes to give the name of its author. They appeared anonymously. The titles placed above them in our Bibles owe their origin to an ecclesiastical tradition which deserves no confidence whatever" (Bible for Learners, vol. iii. pp. 24-25).

"These Gospels 'can hardly be said to have had authors at all. They had only editors or compilers. What I mean is, that those who enriched the old Christian literature with these Gospels did not go to work as independent writers and compose their own narratives out of the accounts they had collected, but simply took up the different stories or sets of stories which they found current in the oral tradition or already reduced to writing,

adding here and expanding there, and so sent out into the world a very artless kind of composition. These works were then, from time to time, somewhat enriched by introductory material or interpolations from the hands of later Christians, and perhaps were modified a little here and there. Our first two Gospels appear to have passed through more than one such revision. The third, whose writer says in his preface, that 'many had undertaken to put together a narrative (Gospel),' before him, appears to proceed from a single collecting, arranging, and modifying hand" (Ibid., p. 29).

Concerning the time when the canon of the New Testament was settled, Mosheim says: "The opinions, or rather the conjectures, of the learned concerning the time when the books of the New Testament were collected into one volume; as also about the authors of that collection, are extremely different. This important question is attended with great and almost insuperable difficulties to us in these later times" (Mosheim, Vol. i. pt. 2, ch. ii).

"Dr. Lardner says: 'Even so late as the middle of the sixth century, the canon of the New Testament had not been settled by any authority that was decisive and universally acknowledged, but Christian people were at liberty to judge for themselves concerning the genuineness of writings proposed to them as apostolical, and to determine according to evidences'" (*Credibility of the Gospels*, T. W. Doane, Bible Myth And Their Parallels In Other Religions, The Truth Seeker Co., New York, 1882, p. 464.).

The learned Michaelis says: "No manuscript of the New Testament now extant is prior to the sixth century, and what is to be lamented, various readings which, as appears from the quotations of the Fathers, were in the text of the Greek Testament, are to be found in none of the manuscripts which are at present remaining" (Marsh's Michaelis, Vol. ii. p. 160).

Bishop Marsh says: "It is a certain fact, that several readings in our common printed text are nothing more than alterations made by Origen, whose authority was so great in the Christian Church (A.D. 230) that emendations which he proposed, though, as he himself (acknowledged, they were supported by evidence of no manuscript, were very generally received" (Ibid., p. 368)

"Though Irenaeus, in the second century, is the first who mentions the evangelists, and Origen, in the third century, is the first who gives us a catalogue of the books contained in the New Testament, Mosheim's admission still stands before us. We have no grounds of assurance that the mere mention of the names of the evangelists by Irenaeus, or the arbitrary drawing up of a particular catalogue by Origen, were of any authority. It is still unknown by whom, or where, or when, the canon of the New Testament was settled. But in this absence of positive evidence we have abundance of negative proof. We know when it was not settled. We know it was not settled in the time of Emperor Justinian, nor in the time of Cassiodorus; that is, not at any time before the middle of the sixth century, "by any authority that was decisive and universally acknowledged; but Christian people were at liberty to judge for themselves concerning the genuineness of writings proposed to them as apostolical" (T. W. Doane, Bible Myth And Their Parallels In Other Religions, The Truth Seeker Co., New York, 1882, p. 464.).

"The Bible (New Testament) has been received by the Protestants on the authority of the church of Rome, and on no other authority. It is she that has said it is the word of God." Ingersoll's Works, Vol 5, Ibid., p. 364.

"None of those books have the appearance of being written by the persons whose names they bear, neither do we know who the authors were. They come to us on no other authority than the church of Rome, which the Protestant Priests...call the Whore of Babylon." Ingersoll's Works, Vol 5, Ibid., p. 365.

"...the bishop who has answered me has been obliged to acknowledge the fact, that the Books that compose the NT, were voted by yeas and nays to be the word of God, as you now vote a law, by the Popish councils of Nicea and Laodicea, about 1,450 years ago." Interviews, Ingersoll's Works, Vol 5, Ibid. p. 325.

"I admit that books were voted in and out, and that the Bible was finally formed in accordance with a vote...." Interviews, Ingersoll's Works, Vol 5, p. 300.

"Nothing can exceed the credulity of the early fathers, unless it may be their ignorance. They believed

everything that was miraculous. They believed everything except the truth.... They revelled in the mishapen and the repulsive. They did not think it wrong to swear falsely in a good cause. They interpolated, forged, and changed the records to suit themselves, for the sake of Christ. They quoted from persons who never wrote. They misrepresented those who had written, and their evidence is absolutely worthless. They were ignorant, credulous, mendacious, fanatical, pious, unreasonable, bigoted, hypocritical, and for the most part insane." Interviews, Ingersoll's Works, Vol. 5, p. 273

"The great religious historian, Eusebius, ingenuously remarks that in his history he carefully omitted whatever tended to discredit the church, and that he piously magnified all that conduced to her glory." Interviews, Ingersoll's Works, Vol. 5, Ibid., Vol. 1, p. 293

"Now, Sir, it is impossible for serious men, to whom God has given the divine gift of reason, and who employs that reason to reverence and adore the God that gave it, it is I say, impossible for such a man to put confidence in a book that abounds with fable and falsehood as the New Testament does." The Life and Works of Thomas Paine, Vol. 9, p. 128

"Taylor's [Reverend Robert Taylor 1784 - 1844], conclusion is: 'As we see Protestantism to be a mere modification or reform of Popery, so Popery was nothing more than a similar modification or reform of Paganism. It is absolutely certain that the pagans were in possession of the whole Gospel story many ages before its JEWISH ORIGIN WAS PRETENDED; and it was not until the first error had been committed of suffering the people to become acquainted too intimately with the contents of the sacred books that it became necessary to invent a chronology, and to 'give to airy nothing a local habitation and a name.'" H. Cutner [1881-1969], The Devil's Chaplain Robert Taylor (1784-1844), The Pioneer Press, c. 1950, 41.

"The gradual development of the canon, in our view, was primarily the achievement of gentile Christianity, although of course THERE WOULD HAVE BEEN NO NEW TESTAMENT IF AN OLD TESTAMENT HAD NOT ALREADY EXISTED. Among the earliest Christians there was no New Testament; their Bible consisted of the Old Testament alone." The Formation of the New Testament, Robert M. Grant, Harper & Row, 1965.

"Ironically, the more fully the individual documents of the NT have been understood, the LESS INTELLIGIBLE the NT as a whole has become, both historically and theologically." [13]. . . . from: The New Testament Canon, Harry Y. Gamble, Fortress, 1985. The New Testament Canon, Harry Y. Gamble, Fortress, 1985).

As von Harnack [Adolph von Harnack 1851 - 1930] has pointed out (The Origin of the New Testament [New York, 1925], p. 5), there were four possibilities open to the Church: [1] the Old Testament alone, [2] an enlarged Old Testament, [3] no Old Testament, and [4] a second authoritative collection." The Canon of the New Testament, Bruce M. Metzger, Oxford, 1987.

"...originally NONE OF THE DOCUMENTS NOW INCLUDED IN THE NEW TESTAMENT HAD THE TITLES TO WHICH WE HAVE BECOME ACCUSTOMED in the headings of the different books in traditional English versions....Only after several Gospels or several Epistles had been collected together was there need for separate designations in order to distinguish one from another." The Canon of the New Testament, Bruce M. Metzger, Oxford, 1987, p.302).

'With respect to attribution, the [apocryphal] books resemble Jewish midrashim and the Old Testament apocrypha. TO SECURE AUTHORITY OR CREDIBILITY, THEY ARE WRITTEN UNDER THE HONORARY NAME OF AN APOSTLE OR SOME OTHER PROMINENT FIGURE. Put flatly, THEY ARE FORGED, but then SO ARE MANY [ALL!] OF THE CANONICAL NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS..." The Secret Gospels A Harmony of Apocryphal Jesus Traditions, Edited and Translated by R. Joseph Hoffmann, Westminster College-Oxford, Prometheus, 1996.

The Catholic Encyclopedia is quoted saying: "Until the Council of Trent, in 1546, there was no infallibly defined sanction of inspiration of these Jewish "apocrypha"; like the "canon" sacred Books of the Hebrew Bible, all alike were more or less eclectically accepted and used in the True Church; but, as said: "The Tridentine decree

from which the above list is extracted was the first infallible and effectually promulgated pronouncement on the Canon, addressed to the Church universal. Being dogmatic in its purport, it implies that the Apostles bequeathed the same Canon to the Church as a part of the depositum fidei.... We should search the pages of the New Testament in vain for any trace of such action.... We affirm that such a status points to Apostolic sanction, which in turn must have rested on revelation either by Christ or the Holy Spirit" (Catholic Encyclopedia, vol. iii, 270.). This is luminous clerical reasoning: a lot of anonymous Jewish fables, derided by Jews and all the rest of the world for want of even common plausibility of fact or truth, and as to which the "inspired" Christian Books said to emanate from Apostles, are silent as the grave, are declared after 1500 years to have the earmarks of Apostolic sanction, which "must have" been founded on divine revelation to them "either by Christ or the Holy Spirit,"—which the Church claims are one and the same Person; and it is curious that the "infallible" Council couldn't say which was which, but vaguely and uncertainly opined it must have been one or the other. So much for infallible cock-suredness as to "inspiration" of Holy Scriptures. (Joseph Wheless, Forgery In Christianity, Alfred Knoph, New York, 1930, p. 54).

"The New Testament and the inspired Apostles are silent on the subject (inspiration) and left the matter to serious doubts and disputations for many centuries : "There are no indications in the New Testament . . . Of a definite new Canon bequeathed by the Apostles to the Church, or of a strong self-witness to Divine inspiration," admits the CE. (iii, 274); that is, there is nothing in the 27 booklets which would lead to the suspicion of their "inspiration" or truth. There was then no Church for them to bequeath to, nor was the Canon settled, as we shall see: "It was not until about the middle of the second century— [when we shall see the books were really written]—that under the rubric of Scripture the New Testament writings were assimilated to the Old.... But it should be remembered that the inspired character of the New Testament is a Catholic dogma, and must therefore in some way have been revealed to, and taught by, Apostles"! (Ibid., p.275.) This is a strikingly queer bit of clerical dialectic, and leaves the question of the "some way" of revelation to the Apostles and of their transmission of the "dogma" to posterity, in a nebulously unsatisfying state." (Joseph Wheless, Forgery In Christianity, Alfred Knoph, New York, 1930, p. 97-98).

"Further, the dubious and disputed status of the sacred writings through centuries, and the ultimate settlement of the controversies by the "ipse dixit" of a numerical majority of the Council of Trent, in 1546,—after the Reformation had forced the issue, is thus admitted: "The idea of a complete and clear-cut canon of the New Testament existing from the beginning, that is, from Apostolic times, has no foundation in history. The canon of the New Testament, like that of the Old, is the result of a development, of a process at once stimulated by disputes with doubters, both within and without the Church, and retarded by certain obscurities and natural hesitations, and which did not reach its final term until the dogmatic definition of the Tridentine Council.... And this want of an organized distribution, secondarily to the absence of an early fixation of the Canon, left room for variations and doubts which lasted far into the centuries." (CE. iii, 274.) The *modus operandi* of the Holy Council in ultimately "canonizing" Jerome's old Vulgate Version, and its motive for doing so, are thus exposed by the keen pen of the author of The Rise and Fall: "When the Council of Trent resolved to pronounce sentence on the Canon of Scripture, the opinion which prevailed, after some debate, was to declare the Latin Vulgate authentic and almost infallible; and this sentence, which was guarded by formidable anathemas, secured all the books of the Old and New Testament which composed that ancient version.... When the merit of that version was discussed, the majority of the theologians urged, with confidence and success, that it was absolutely necessary to receive the Vulgate as authentic and inspired, unless they wished to abandon the victory to the Lutherans, and the honors of the Church to the Grammarians." (Gibbon, A Vindication, v, 2; Istoria del Consiglio Tridentino, L. ii, p. 147.) A number of these books were bitterly disputed and their authenticity and inspiration denied by the leading Reformers, Luther, Grotius, Calvin, etc., and excluded from their official lists, until finally the Reformed Church followed the example of the Church hopeless of reform and swallowed the canon whole, as we have it today,—minus, of course, the Tobit, Judith, and like inspired buffooneries of the True Bible" (Joseph Wheless, Forgery In Christianity, Alfred Knoph, New York, 1930, p. 97-98).

"And no other Pope, Bishop or Father (except Papias and until Irenaeus), for nearly a century after "Pope Clement," ever mentions or quotes a Gospel, or names Matthew, Mark, Luke or John. So for a century and a half—until the books bobbed up in the hands of Bishop St. Irenaeus and were tagged as "Gospels according to" this or that Apostle, there exists not a word of them in all the tiresome tomes of the Fathers. It is humanly and

divinely impossible that the "Apostolic authorship" and hence "canonicity" or divine inspiration of these Sacred Four should have remained, for a century and a half, unknown and unsuspected by every Church, Father, Pope and Bishop of Christendom—if existent. Even had they been somewhat earlier in existence, never an inspired hint or human suspicion was there, that they were "Divine" or "Apostolic," or any different from the scores of "apocryphal or pseudo-Biblical writings with which the East especially had been flooded,"—that they were indeed "Holy Scripture." Hear this notable admission: "It was not until about the middle of the second century that under the rubric of Scripture the New Testament writings were assimilated to the Old" (CE. iii, 275),—that is, be-came regarded as apostolic, sacred, inspired and canonical,—or "Scriptures" (Joseph Wheless, Forgery In Christianity, Alfred Knoph, New York, 1930, p. 182-183).

"To argue and prove that the Four (Gospels) were regarded as "Apostolic" and hence "canonical" after the middle of the second century, argues and proves that until that late date they were not so regarded,— which we have seen is impossible if they had been written by Apostles a hundred years and more previously and authorized by them "for the purpose of being read in the Churches," as the very ground and pillar of their foundation and faith....Follow the proofs and argument of the Church to its own undoing: 'From the testimony of St. Irenaeus (A.D. 185) alone there can be no reasonable doubt that the Canon of the Gospel was inalterably fixed in the Catholic Church by the last quarter of the second century to the exclusion of any pretended Evangels. [Sundry writings mentioned] presuppose the authority enjoyed by the Fourfold Gospel towards the middle of the second century.... Even Rationalistic scholars like Harnack admit the canonicity of the quadriform Gospel between the years 140-175.' (CE. iii, 275.) Even CE. does not prove or claim that it was any earlier; so here the Church and the Rationalists are in accord on this fatal fact! Certainly Popes Peter and Clement I, not to review the silent others, would have "inalterably fixed" the Divine Canonicity of the Four a century before, if they had known about these precious productions of the Apostles;—if, in fact, they had existed, the known works of Holy Apostles and apostolic men! But until "towards the middle of the second century" there was no "canon" or notion of divinely inspired Apostolic Gospels—simply for the reason that until just about that period they were not in existence....The sudden appearance at a certain late date, of a previously unknown document, which is then attributed to an earlier age and long since dead writers, is one of the surest earmarks of forgery" (Joseph Wheless, Forgery In Christianity, Alfred Knoph, New York, 1930, p. 184-185).

Surely after these few quotes you should be moved to want to know more about the document you have accepted "by faith" only and without personal investigation as to its claims and authority for your life.

GETTING STARTED

I think it appropriate that we begin our investigation of this issue concerning the canonization of the New Testament by turning to The Light of Reason, volume one, a writing that appeared several years ago by Schmuel Golding, the editor of the Biblical Polemics newsletter. Golding's synopsis of the process by which the Bible was formed is not only accurate but succinct. On page 23 he says,

"First the NT was not written by any of the disciples of Jesus nor by persons who even lived in that era . . . When the church fathers compiled the NT in the year 397, they collected all the writings they could find and managed them as they pleased. They decided by vote which of the books out of the collection they had made should be the word of God and which should not. They rejected several, they voted others to be doubtful, and those books which had a majority of votes were voted to be the word of God. Had they voted otherwise, all the people since calling themselves Christians would have believed otherwise. For the belief of the one comes from the vote of the other."

It is important to note the key concept here is that the Bible was put together by a group of men who met, went through a collection of writings, and chose through voting those that are to be deemed divinely inspired. Many of them wound up on the cutting room floor. Golding continues,

Who the people were that did all of this we know little of. They called themselves by the general name of church fathers and this is all the average Christian knows of the matter.... Disputes, however, ran high among the people calling themselves Christians not only as to points of doctrine but as to the authenticity of the books.

Although not stated verbatim, the essence of Golding's next paragraph is that when disputes broke out the opposition was often either eliminated or ostracized. Then, he continues by saying,

Constantine, an unbaptized pagan, convened the Council of Nicea in the year 325 in order to settle these disputes. A major issue was the nature of the deity they worshipped. Based upon their decisions Jesus was changed from man to God in the flesh, the sabbath was changed from Saturday to Sunday, the Passover was changed to Easter . . . and the NT was canonized as a holy book.

Answer for yourself: Knowing the events just described, can you explain to yourself how the Holy Spirit could be leading the changing of the Eternal Sabbath to Sunday, or changing the Passover to the pagan holiday of Istar (Easter), or making a human messiah a G-d, which is admitted by most to be scandalous; yet we are to believe that in spite of such blunders by the Holy Spirit He got right the selection of a New Bible? Did the Holy Spirit have a bad day or something? Surely you can see that such events were not led by the Holy Spirit at all...for G-d cannot and will not contradict His Word...man may change it....as you saw...but the jots and titles are forever!

THE NEW TESTAMENT...THE WORK OF MEN OR GOD...WHO DO WE BLAME?

In other words, men, rather than G-d, composed the New Testament. And for that reason it is suspect in many regards whether you knew it or not. Many Christians, especially Protestants, have great difficulty with any assertion to the effect that men and not G-d is responsible for the New Testament coming into existence. On page 6 in Answering Christianity's Most Puzzling Questions, volume one, apologist Richard Sisson states.

"In fact, after the death of Jesus a whole flood of books that claimed to be inspired appeared.... [D]isputes over which ones were true were so intense that the debate continued for centuries. Finally in the fourth century a group of church leaders called a council and took a vote. The 66 books that comprised our cherished Bible were declared to be Scripture by a vote of 568 to 563."

Although this happens to be basically what occurred, Sisson then proceeds to allege that this is not what happened. He states on page 7 that what really occurred is that, "Actually when the council of Hippo in A.D. 393 and the Council of Carthage in A.D. 397, named the 27 books of our NT as authentic, they were simply recognizing the inspiration of those books."

Sisson has managed to highlight the key difference between the Protestant and Catholic positions. The Catholic position is historically more accurate and simply states that the church fathers assembled in a council, went through all the writings that were circulating at that time and chose the ones that were to be deemed divinely inspired. In other words, the church fathers, men, put the book together by a vote. The Protestant position, on the other hand, is that men went through the writings and chose those that were divinely inspired through mere recognition. They had already been made divinely inspired by God prior to their analysis. The difference between the positions is essentially one of recognition versus determination. Catholics say their leaders determined which books were divinely inspired; Protestants say they were divinely inspired by God and later recognized as such. In one case men did it; in the other God supposedly did it.

Theologically speaking, by simply stating that God created the book and men only discovered that fact, the Protestant position is stronger. Historically speaking, however, the Catholic position is much stronger and clearly more accurate. Men merely convened and determined which books were divinely inspired. Their choices were motivated by their current "religious beliefs;" many of which can be shown to be in conflict with the Old Testament and the Bible Jesus used. In Today's Handbook for Solving Bible Difficulties apologist David O'Brien on page 41 upholds the Protestant position by contending that although church councils put their stamps of approval on the canon of Scripture, "that canon was in place before they ever thought of meeting to approve it."

Ryrie makes the same point on page 108 in Basic Theology: "Remember that the books were inspired when they were written and thus canonical. The church only attested to what was inherently true."

And in Evidence that Demands a Verdict apologist Josh McDowell states the same position on page 33: "But the upshot of the Jamnia debates [Jamnia was another council in which the books of the Bible were being determined] was the firm acknowledgment that all these books were holy Scripture."

In other words, the church fathers simply acknowledged, they did not determine the books to be holy Scripture. But McDowell makes the following statement on page 29,

The word "canon" as applied to Scripture means an officially accepted list of books. One thing to keep in mind is that the church did not create the canon or the books included in what we call Scripture. Instead the church recognized that the books were inspired from their inception.... We don't know exactly what criteria the early church used to choose the canonical books.

McDowell had just stated that God inspired the canonical books. So how can he say that he does not know the criteria by which they were chosen? The criterion must be that they are God-inspired. An inadvertent contradiction is in evidence.

In essence, although possessed of a more impressive stance theologically, the Protestant position is historically indemonstrable. Historical evidence strongly implies that the books were not canonical but simply deemed as such by a group of influential religious and political figures. The book was put together by a vote; it was not compiled by God and subsequently discovered to be God's work.

IT IS TIME FOR AN HONEST LOOK AT THE NEW TESTAMENT



A HONEST LOOK INTO THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...BY WHOM AND WHERE?

MORE QUESTIONS:

- **Who first affirmed the books of the New Testament to be "inspired?"**
- **Why were they so affirmed?**
- **What was the intellectual character of the affirmants?**
- **Who, as far as is known, compiled them into the volume we now have called the New Testament?**
- **What books are now included in the New Testament which in earlier days were excluded?**
- **What books are now excluded which were then in earlier days included?**
- **What councils of the church voted on the canonical list?**
- **What books did they "vote in" and "vote out?"**
- **Where did the theory begin that one must believe the New Testament or be damned?**

WHAT IS MY PURPOSE IN SHARING THE FOLLOWING INFORMATION?

In inviting the reader to share the inquiry, I wish to assure him that I have no theory to advocate. In opposing what I believe to be error, I desire simply to offer the evidence which is easily accessible to most, which seems not to have had its due prominence in theological discussion among the masses, and which, if properly appreciated, must result in great changes in religious beliefs.

THE MAIN SOURCES OF ANTIQUITY.....LISTENING AND LEARNING FROM THEM

The writings of the Christian Fathers, the Ecclesiastical History of Eusebius (the oldest Christian history now extant) and the modern works, On The Canon of the New Testament, by Brooke Foss Westcott, D.D., and The Canon of the Bible, by Prof. Samuel Davidson, D.D., are the main sources from which the information in these articles are chiefly drawn. But we are not limited by these as the sources are in reality almost endless if one chooses to look the the problem of the New Testament. The inexperienced person has little idea of the difficulty which the critical party finds in getting its facts before the public; nor of the systematic suppression used by the Christian media and clergy to prevent unpleasant truths concerning the Christian religion from coming out. There is not an orthodox Christian media source I know of that will publish the facts concerning the origin of the New Testament which are given in these articles. Men who know the Christian theology to be untrue, have to get their audience as best they can. Thus the importance of the Internet for our world today.

One would suppose that the Christian clergy would be familiar with the history of the New Testament and how it came to be compiled (the canonization of the New Testament), the truth is, it is one of the subjects least understood. For our purposes, by "canon" is meant the list of the books composing the New Testament. Among the early Christians it meant the list of the books appointed to be read in the churches, and later, it came to mean the list of books which were sources and test of doctrine.

ORIGIN OF THE BOOKS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT...BY WHOM AND WHEN?

The reader must bear in mind that most of the books in the New Testament are anonymous. Despite the names appearing at the beginning of your Gospels in the New Testament or over the epistles no one knows who wrote them, or at least most of them, and no one knows when they were written. As to their origin there have been conjectures, but the number of authors named is about equal to the number of commentators engaged in the guessing.

This might come as a shock to you but the books of the New Testament which have no known authors are Matthew, Mark, Luke, John, Acts, the Epistles to the Ephesians, Colossians, First Timothy, Second Timothy, Titus, Hebrews, the Epistle of James, Second Peter, Second John, Third John, Jude, and perhaps Revelation. The genuineness of Paul's Epistles to the Ephesians and Colossians is doubted by some scholars, though the majority accept them as from Paul. **But this leaves ten of Paul's Epistles and the First of Peter, the First of John, and it may be Revelation as the only genuine writings in the New Testament!**

Prof. Davidson says that the Gospel of Matthew, as we have it now, could not have been written by Matthew (Intro. New Test., i. 484). In his book he goes on to explain why the present Gospel of Mark was not written by Mark, and that its author is unknown (Ibid., ii. 83-84). He also makes a strong case that Luke did not write the Gospel now bearing his name (Ibid., ii. 25). Of the Gospel of John he says:

"Its existence before 140 A.D. is incapable either of decisive or probable showing....The Johannine authorship has receded before the tide of modern criticism; and though this tide is arbitrary at times, it is here irresistible" (Canon, 127).

"No certain trace of existence of the Fourth Gospel can be found till after Justin Martyr, ie., till after the middle of the second century" (Intro. New Test., ii. 520).

Of course, if it were not written till 140 or 150 A.D., the Apostle John could not have been its author, for he was dead long before that.

Again, Prof. Davidson says:

"If it be asked whether all the New Testament writings proceeded from the authors whose names they bear, criticism can not reply in the affirmative" (Canon, 153).

"Textual criticism has been employed to discredit the true dates of the present Gospels (i.e., to make them earlier than they really were), and the most exaggerated descriptions have been given of the frequent transcriptions of the text and its great corruption in the second century (i.e., the believers say the evidence of the late dates are corruptions of the second century)...But the evidence in favor of the authors traditionally assigned to the Gospels and some of the Epistles, is still uncertain. A wide gap intervenes between eye-witnesses of the apostles or apostolic men that wrote the sacred books, and the earliest Fathers who assert such authorship. The traditional bridge between them is a precarious one" (Canon, 159).

The Epistles to Titus, and the First and Second Epistles to Timothy, commonly known as the "Pastoral Epistles," were not written by Paul (Davidson, Canon, 239, 252, 261; Intro. New Test., ii. 193-194). What is of major importance for the reader to understand is that prior to the year 170 A.D., nothing was heard of the

Second Epistle of Peter (Westcott, Canon, 227), and it was not generally known till the close of the third century (Ibid., 242). Dr. Westcott says that its canonicity can not even now, on historical grounds, be pronounced certainly authentic, and the most he can say for it is that it is better supported than the Shepherd of Hermas or the Epistle of Barnabas (Westcott, Canon, 227), of which we now hear nothing.

There has never been a time when the book of Revelation was not discarded by many persons competent to judge. The churches to which it was addressed, those in Asia, are the very ones which rejected it! It was not in the Bibles of the Eastern Christians for more than one thousand five hundred years, and was incorporated into those Bibles less than three centuries ago. Dionysius said that many of the early Christians denounced it as being without sense or reason, and as the forgery of Cerinthus (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., vii. 25). Dionysius himself did not believe it was written by John the Apostle (Ibid.), he did not know who did write it, although in another place he intimates that Cerinthus did so, and forged John's name to it (Ibid., iii. 28). Papias suggested that it might have been written by John the presbyter (Ibid., iii. 39). Caius said it was written by Cerinthus (Ibid., iii. 28). So great was the hostility and contempt for it in the East, that there is reason to believe that the bishops would not allow it to be read in the churches (Westcott, Canon, 442, note 2). In the synod of Toledo, a Western church, in 671 A.D., a special decree had to be passed affirming its authority (Ibid., 447, note 4). And so late as the sixteenth century, Beza, the friend of Luther and Calvin, conjectured that it was written by Mark (Prov. Apocalypsis).

Even yet, the Pauline authority of the Epistle of Hebrews, and its right to a place in the New Testament, have been denied by orthodox theologians. The genuine letters have the superscription, "Paul, called to be an Apostle," etc. This Epistle has none. Originally, no one claimed it to have been written by Paul. Tertullian, (202 A.D.), the Christian Father, said it was written by Barnabas (De dic. 20). In the Clermont manuscript it is to this day called the Epistle of Barnabas (Westcott, Canon, 263). The Old Latin version does not contain it (Ibid., 254). It was added subsequently, and then as an anonymous production (Ibid.). The early Latin Fathers, with entire unanimity, ignore it, and exclude it from the Bible. According to Origin some said it was written by Clement of Rome, others by Luke. Origin himself said, "But who it was that really wrote this epistle, God only knows" (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., vi. 23). Philastrius, of Brescia (387 A.D.), rejected it, saying that in some churches it was not read, and that its authorship was variously attributed to Barnabas, Clement of Rome, Luke and Paul (Haer. lxxxix). Grotius, in the seventeenth century, said it was obviously not written by Paul, and he believed it was written by Luke (Pref. To Hebrews). He also believed that the original title of the Second Epistle of Peter was the "Epistle of Simeon," James' successor as Bishop of Jerusalem (Pref. To 2 Peter). He also believed that the present Epistle was not the original one, but was compiled from two others by Simeon, of which the second begins as the third chapter. Dr. Westcott says that the Epistle to the Hebrews can not be shown to have been written by Paul (Westcott, Canon, 356). Kitto's Cyclopedia of the Bible says that its Pauline authorship, and its canonicity are assumptions, neither of which is admitted on all hands to have conclusive evidence (Art. "Hebrews, Epistle to the"). **And yet, in the face of facts like these, certain Christian teachers have told us that we must believe these books, or be damned eternally in a like of literal fire!** That is what unbelievers are opposing. They are not trying to tear down public morality. They are protesting against the elevation of stupidity as intelligence!

HOW DID WE EVER LEARN THESE THINGS?...THROUGH HISTORICAL CRITICISM...

When the assertion is made that it has been proved that Matthew did not write the Gospel bearing his name, and that a particular book was not written by the person to whom it is usually attributed, the question is asked, "How does scholarship learn these things?" It is by what is known as the "historical method" of criticism. In case of a literary forgery, it is often easy to show that the work was not written by the person claimed as its author, while at the same time it would be utterly impossible to show who did write it. A few evidence that the Gospel of John was not written by the Apostle, will illustrate how the method is used.

1. The book does not claim to have been written by John. It is called the Gospel "according" to John.
2. It was not heard of till about the year 180 A.D., nearly a hundred years after John was dead. No one of the

Christian writers previous to that date makes the slightest mention of it. The inference is that it was not yet in existence.

3. It came into use first among the heretics, who did not ascribe it to John. It was not until toward the close of the second century that the book was attributed to him and then by the Fathers of the church (Davidson, Intro. New Test., ii. 520).
4. The Gospel of John says that Bethsaida was in Galilee (John 12:21). There is no such town in that district, and there never was. Bethsaida was on the east side of the sea of Tiberius, whereas Galilee was on the west side. St. John was born at Bethsaida, and the probability is that he would know the geographical location of his own birth-place.
5. John was the son of Zebedee (Matt. 10:2), and a Jew. But the author of the Gospel speaks of the Jews in the second and third persons. He says the "feasts of the Jews" (John 5:1), "the Passover, a feast of the Jews" (John 6:4), "the manner of the purifying of the Jews" (John 2:6), the law of the Jews is called "your law" (John 7:19; 10:34), "their law" (John 15:25), and he calls the Jews the children of the devil (John 8:44).
6. The other Evangelists narrate certain miracles, and say that John was the only one of the four Gospel writers who was an eyewitness; yet John does not mention them. The raising of Jarius' daughter is an illustration. This was a most astounding feat, enough to have stunned the observer and fixed him with amazement for a lifetime; and one would suppose that every well-authenticated case would have been carefully preserved by those who saw it. Matthew and Mark and Luke all narrate it. Mark and Luke distinctly assert that of the four Evangelists John was the only one present; but the Gospel of John makes not the slightest reference to it. The transfiguration is another. It is the only event of the kind that has ever occurred, and therefore the men who witnessed it ought certainly to have said something of it. Matthew, Mark, and Luke, who were not present, describe it. Each asserts in the plainest terms that, of the four Gospel writers, John was the only one who saw it. Yet John does not even hint at it!

These are a few of the evidence that John did not write the Gospel now bearing his name, and they give an idea of how scholars determine the fact that a work is a forgery.

THE TESTIMONY OF ANTIQUITY...SILENCE SPEAKS LOUDER THAN WORDS SOMETIMES

The reader has heard so much from orthodox sources, of the "unanimous testimony of antiquity to the authenticity of the Gospels," that he will be interested in knowing what that testimony is.

The first Christian writer whose works have come to us is Paul, and his Epistles we have in the New Testament. He makes no mention of the Four Gospels, makes no quotations from them, and makes not the slightest reference to them. The First Epistle of Peter, the First of John, which are generally believed to be genuine, and the Revelation of John, whose authenticity is conceded by many unbelievers, do not mention the Gospels, and do not quote from them. Likewise we have the book of Acts, Second John, Third John, James, and Jude, but none of them mentions the Four Gospels, or quotes from them, or gives the slightest indication that its author ever heard of them.

The Apostolic Fathers are they who immediately succeeded the Apostles, and the first of them was Clement of Rome (97 A.D.). We have his Epistle to the Corinthians, but in them there is no mention of either Matthew, Mark, Luke, or John. After him comes Ignatius (115 A.D.), from whom we have four epistles, believed to be genuine. Neither of them makes the least mention of the Four Gospels. Polycarp (116 A.D.), has an epistle passing under his name. It in there is no mention of any of the Four Gospels. There is an epistle attributed to Barnabas, the companion of Paul, but probably written about 130 A.D. It makes no mention of either of the Four Gospels. And, finally, there is the book called "The Shepherd of Hermas," generally conceded to be the work of Hermas or Rome, about the year 150 A.D. It like all the other books and epistles here referred to, is devoted to doctrinal and ethical ends, but it makes no reference to either of the Four Gospels. This comprises the whole of the existing Christian literature from the death of Jesus to the middle of the second century, and not one writer mentions the Four Gospels, or makes the slightest reference to them. They make quotations from

tradition and from other Gospels, but not from our four.

We come to Papias, the Church Father, who lived about 150 A.D. (Davidson, Canon, 123). He says:

"And John the presbyter also said this: 'Mark being the interpreter of Peter, whatever he recorded he wrote with great accuracy, but not, however, in the order in which it was spoken or done by our Lord, for he neither heard nor followed our Lord, but, as before said, he was in company with Peter, who gave him such instruction as was necessary, but not to give a history or our Lord's discourses; wherefore Mark has not erred in anything, by writing some things as he has recorded them; for he was carefully attentive to one thing, not to pass by anything that he heard, or to state anything falsely in these accounts'" (Euseb., Eccl. Hist. iii. 39).

The question is, Does Papias here refer to our Gospel according to Mark?

1. We do not know what Papias said. His works are lost, and this quotation has been preserved in Eusebius' Ecclesiastical History. We only know what Eusebius says he said.
2. Papias preferred tradition to written records (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., iii. 39). The testimony of such a man is not trustworthy. Eusebius says that he was a man of "very limited comprehension," and that the traditions of Jesus which he collected were "rather too fabulous" (Ibid.).
3. Papias does not say that he ever saw the work. He simply mentions a traditions handed down by John the presbyter. It was natural enough that years after Jesus' death his followers should inquire, "Have we no records of his life?" and that a report should start that some one had written such a work. Later one, persons hearing the report, but finding no book, and seeing the opportunity would write one to fill the vacancy. Just as Revelation prophesied an Everlasting Gospel (Rev. 14:6), and in the 13th century one appeared of that name. Somebody saw an unfulfilled prophesy and took it on himself to make it good.
4. Suppose Papias is referring to our Gospel of Mark; what testimony have we to the authenticity of Jesus' words as contained in it? Just this: Eusebius says that Papias said that John the presbyter said that Mark said that Peter said that Jesus said thus and so. That is the historical lineage of the authenticity of the Gospel of Mark. When the reader has that, he has it all. He knows as much of it as the best theologian does, and is just as competent to decide whether or not it is to be credited. Eusebius goes on to say:

"Such is the account of Papias concerning Mark. Of Matthew, he has stated as follows: 'Matthew composed his history in the Hebrew dialect, and every one translated it as he was able' (Euseb., Eccl. History, iii. 39).

Does Papias refer to our present Gospel according to Matthew?

1. He says that Matthew wrote his Gospel in Hebrew. Our Gospel is in Greek.
2. If this is Matthew's Gospel, who translated it? No one knows. The assertion of Christian apologists that the translation was by any specific persons is pure assumption. Jerome asserts that the translator was uncertain (De. Vir. III., 3).
3. There were formerly another Gospel passing under the name of Matthew, which was used by Christians (McClintock and Strong, Cyclop., Art. "Matthew, Gospel of," iv. 3). How are we to know that the church as the right one? Nobody can tell.

To make the matter short, scholars admit that our Gospel of Matthew and Mark were not referred to. Tischendorf grants it ("When Were Our Gospels Written:" by Constantine Tischendorf; Religious Tract Society's edition, authorized. London, 1869, p. 107), and Prof. Davidson fully concedes it:

"Papias speaks of Matthew and Mark; but it is most probable that he had documents which either formed the basis of our present Matthew and Mark, or were taken into them and written over" (Davidson, Canon of the Bible, p. 124).

"The canonical Gospels of Matthew and Mark can not be identified with the logia of Matthew, and the things said and done by Jesus which Mark wrote, mentioned by Papias. The writer himself does not identify them" (Into. N.T., ii. 520).

This brings us to a period nearly one hundred and twenty years after the death of Jesus, and we have no evidence of the existence of our Four Gospels.

We will continue our study as we pick up with Justin Martyr and what he contributes to our quest for an honest look into the history of the New Testament.



AN HONEST LOOK INTO THE HISTORY OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...SILENCE OF JUSTIN MARTYR

We finished the prior article by examining the astonishing lack of quotes of the New Testament in early Christian literature up until the middle second century (roughly 150 A.D.). This is absolutely amazing when you see the silence of early Church writers as to any reference to the existence of "any" of the Four Gospels which we today are told to believe were written early and by the Apostles of Jesus. Such is not the case upon examination of early Patristic Literature.

THE TESTIMONY OF JUSTIN MARTYR...OR THE LACK THERE OF...

Now we move to Justin Martyr about one hundred twenty years following the death of Jesus (roughly 150 A.D.). We again find no evidence of the existence of the Four Gospels. Justin Martyr flourished about 150 A.D. He is really the first writer who laid aside tradition, and appealed to records. In his works he frequently quotes from the Old Testament, and from what appears, at first sight, to be the New Testament, and the most strenuous exertions have been put forth by Christian apologists to show that he had our Four Gospels. But they utterly fail. Just makes three hundred and fourteen quotations from the Old Testament, and in one hundred ninety-seven of these—that is, in 2/3 of the cases, he names the book from which he is quoting. **But in making his so-called New Testament quotations, he does not mention the name of any one of our Four Gospels.**

Answer for yourself: Did you understand what I just shared with you? Justin made it a habit of quoting the Old Testament books by name when he quoted from them, but when quoting what one would believe to be "New Testament" quotes he NEVER mentions the name of the book from which the quotation comes. On the other hand, he states, distinctly and repeatedly, that the book from which he is quoting is the "Memoirs of the Apostles" (Apol. I. 66-67; Dial. C. Tryp. 100-104, 106), or the "Memoirs," "all things concerning Jesus Christ" (Apol., i. 33). He also quotes from the "Acts of Pilate" (Apol. I. 35, 48), giving the name of the book, and he refers to the "Memoirs or the Gospel of Peter" (Dial., 106).

Answer for yourself: Now, if he gives so often the names of the Old Testament books from which he quotes, and the names of what were to him the New Testament books which he used, why should he not give the names of the Four Gospels, if, as Christian apologists assert, he quotes from them?

The inference is plain. He was not quoting from our Four Gospels. He was using altogether different books. And yet, Christian theologians have asserted in the most positive manner that he distinctly recognizes all four of the evangelists! I give this as an illustration of the unfairness of orthodoxy and its statements.

To get around this sticky issue many Christian scholars, when advised of the above situation, retort that the

"Memoirs of the Apostles" were in reality our Gospels under a different name. An evidence that this is not true, is that Justin makes nearly a hundred quotations from the "Memoirs," and in but two or three instances are they exactly the same as the parallel New Testament passages. In other words, his quotes don't agree with the New Testament passages in the vast majority of the cases. There is almost invariably some difference, either in sense or construction, showing that **Justin's book was different from the Gospels which would come later. Moreover, he quotes from it things which are not even in the Gospels at all.** He says that the "Memoirs" say that when Jesus went into the Jordan to be baptized a fire was kindled on the river (Dial., 88). There is no such thing in our Gospels. He says that the same devil which tempted Jesus on the Mount also tempted him as he was coming up out of the river (Dial., 108). Our Gospels say nothing to this effect.

You should find it very useful to keep these things in mind, for Justin Martyr's works are the great rallying point and battle-ground of orthodoxy. As he is the first polemical writer Christianity had the church has made every effort to show that he was acquainted with our Four Gospels. The efforts for those who study and read his works personally will show you that such endeavors by the church has been unsuccessful.

Answer for yourself: When was the first mention of the Gospels according to the names we not have for them?

The first writer who mentions either of the Evangelists by name as an author is Theophilus of Antioch in 180 A.D. He speaks of John's Gospel (Ad Adtol., ii. 22), but says nothing of the writer being an apostle. He simply calls the writer an "inspired man."

The first writer who mentions all four of our present Gospels by name was Irenaeus, who flourished in and about 200 A.D.

This is the whole of the "testimony of antiquity," to the beginning of the third century, as to the Four Gospels. The books are not heard of till 150 A.D., that is, till Jesus had been dead nearly a hundred and twenty years. No writer before 150 A.D. makes the slightest mention of them. Then comes the passages from Papias, which, as you now have seen, are rather the reflections of rumors rather than evidence for our Gospels. Justin Martyr does not mention the names of either of them. In quoting from other books, he mentions their names; and the inference is plain that he did not know of our Gospels in 150 A.D. Theophilus of Antioch, a 150 years after Jesus was dead, makes a slight mention of the Gospel of John. But not till the year 200 A.D., nearly one hundred and seventy years after Jesus has died, do we hear of all Four Gospels.

THE EMERGENCE OF THE GOSPELS BEARING THE APOSTLE'S NAMES

One needs to understand that the earliest Church Fathers knew of no Gospels bearing the Apostle's names. It would be almost 170 years following the death of Jesus when the Latter Church Fathers would make reference to them. At the time of Irenaeus around 200 A.D. the Gospels are constantly quoted by the Christian Fathers, and when orthodoxy speaks of the "unanimous testimony of antiquity as to the authenticity of the Gospels," it usually states how many times the books were quoted by Tertullian, Clement of Alexandria, Origen, Eusebius, and other later Fathers. The Gospels were indeed quoted by them, for they all lived this side of the year 200 A.D., when the books had commenced to circulate under their present names. But those later Fathers knew no more of the authorship of the books than we do, and in fact not as much, for they had not the critical ability that this age has. And they do not, when they quote the books, vouch for their authenticity. The Fathers simply give the names by which the books were known; and the earlier Fathers would have given the same names if the books had been known by those names earlier. As Dr. Westcott says:

"The main testimony of the Apostolic Fathers is therefore to the substance and not to the authenticity of the Gospels" (Canon, p. 52).

I sure you can not have but observed how few Christian writings of the first two centuries we have. Dr. Westcott calls it the "dark age of Christian literature" because so scant are its remains; and he practically concluded that

the Four Gospels were not in existence up to the year 150 A.D. by saying:

"A few letters of consolation and warning, two or three apologies addressed to heathen, a controversy with a Jew, a vision, and a scanty gleanings of fragments of lost works, comprise all Christian literature up to the middle of the second century" (Canon, p. 11).

HOW DOES CHRISTIANITY DEAL WITH THIS PROBLEM OF SILENCE?

I have already made mention of the fact that the Christian writers previous to the years 150 A.D. quote from tradition or from Gospels other than our four, and that the most violent efforts are now made to have it appear that the quotations are from our present Gospels. For example, Ignatius, in his epistle to Polycarp, without intimating that he is quoting it from any book or that it is other than his own sentiment, says: "Be in all things wise as a serpent, but harmless as a dove," and modern apologists assert that this is from Matthew, "Be ye therefore wise as serpents and harmless as doves." Polycarp says: "Be merciful, and ye shall obtain mercy," and the claim is that this is the famous beatitude, "Blessed are the merciful, for they shall obtain mercy." There are a number of such passages as these, but they invariably differ more or less either in meaning or language from the New Testament parallels: and in no instance does the writer say that he obtained them from our Gospels! Even if passages were identical with those in the New Testament, they would not prove the existence of our Four Gospels, for there were many Gospels in circulation in the early ages of Christianity, which contained passages identical with those now in our four, and the quotations might have been made either from one of those or from tradition.

You will observe that when the different writers quote the words of Jesus or another person, they generally agree; but that in the narration of the story they differ. This shows that there may have been and probably was a manuscript in existence in those early days, containing the sayings of Jesus and others, and that this was made use of by later writers in composing their narratives. But the fact that the Apostolic Fathers use phrases or quotes sayings, with the prefatory explanation, "It is written," or "The Lord Jesus says," which agree more or less with the passages in our Gospels, does not prove the existence then of the Gospels. Dr Westcott admits this:

"No evangelical reference in the Apostolic Fathers can be referred certainly to a written period. It appears most probable, from the form of the quotations, that they were derived from oral tradition (Canon, 62).



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



IRENÆUS' REFERENCE TO THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW IN 200 A.D: WAS IT REALLY TO THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS?

Guess what? The Gospel of Matthew was not the Gospel of Matthew we have today!

While there is no trace of our Four Gospels previous to the year 150 A.D., and while we do not know who it was after that time that wrote or compiled them, or exactly when they did it, the testimony of the early Fathers as to one of them may throw some light on the subject. Long before our Gospel of Matthew was known, Papias spoke of the "Gospel According to the Hebrews," and said that it contained a history of a woman accused of many sins before the Lord (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., iii. 39). Coming down later in time we find that both Eusebius and Irenaeus agree in saying that the Ebionites used only one Gospel; but Eusebius said it was called the "Gospel According To The Hebrews" (Eccl. Hist., iii. 27), while Irenaeus said it was the "Gospel According to Matthew" (Adv. Her., i 26). **Moreover, both Epiphanius (403 A.D.) and Jerome (420 A.D.) say that the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" and the "Gospel according to Matthew" were the same book under different names.** As the "Gospel according to the Hebrews" was in existence and in use first, the deduction is quite plain that some one subsequently forged Matthew's name to it. So you should understand that when you read that the Ebionites used only one Gospel and one Gospel only, and read that it was called "The Gospel of Matthew" then it in reality does not mean the Gospel of Matthew that we are familiar today, but the "Gospel of the Hebrews."



THE NEW TESTAMENT...THE EARLY CONTROVERSIES SURROUNDING IT

While little is known of the history of the Jewish Canon, of the Christian, fortunately, considerable has been preserved, and the progress of its formation can be traced, step by step, down the centuries. Sadly few Christians know this history and few ever inquire into the development and canonization of the document they stake their Eternal Life upon. Growing up as a Christian, and after attending Southwestern Seminary in Ft.Worth, Texas, where I received an M.Div. I must admit to you I accepted pretty much what was told to me for the most part. Usually I was on two tracks at once; fulfilling my Seminary responsibilities as well as my Pastorate responsibilities. This left little time to study out things in-depth when questions begged answering. Usually I was consumed with preparing for tomorrow's classes and tests as well as the ministry in which I had an active part. It would be a couple years into full-time pastoring following Seminary before I could find the time to investigate the Canon of the New Testament for myself. Up to that time I like most Christians accepted "by faith" what I had been told. **Upon researching the Canon in-depth I was startled to discover what was omitted in my Seminary training; and I understand today why it was omitted! Such facts as I will share with you was either not known, or the consequences of such knowledge being made public would impugn the integrity of the Christian Faith!**

WHAT YOU HAVE FAILED TO SEE....THE TRUTH WITHIN THE NEW TESTAMENT

Most preaching involves homiletical sermons based on this passage or that passage. Seldom is one confronted with the "big picture;" such seldom is recognized unless conscientious in-depth study is undertaken for some time. Some people possess the ability to see the "forest" in spite of the "trees." In other words, some people, sadly the minority, can read a document like the New Testament and see things that are obvious which the vast majority of people overlook. This is not accomplished by intellect alone for the Holy Spirit certainly illuminated past revelation. Some see it; some do not. I find this the case almost all the time. Two people can look at the same passage or passages at the same time and one can see something the other cannot; even after excessive explanation the "blinded" one sometimes cannot see no matter what is done. Such is the revelation of God. Understand because one has not seen or does not know of a "truth" does not invalidate such truth; truth is truth no matter if it is recognized by one or by all. Truth is primary and must the goal of our study of the Word of God.

THE TWO CONFLICTING GOSPELS IN THE NEW TESTAMENT

In what follows I will share and hopefully show you that within the New Testament are two competing and conflicting "gospel." Understand that this fact is not of my creation just I say that this exists, but competent scholars dating back centuries have discussed this issue in detail. So this is not my "personal interpretation" for volumes of books have been written upon this. The problem is that your Church book store or corner Christian book store has not carried such informative literature.

After the death of Jesus, his followers increased in numbers for a quarter of a century before having any literature. Sects formed, and antagonisms arose. Then Paul wrote his Epistles to strengthen his adherents against the assault of other Christian fractions. This is nothing more than "in-house in-fighting." The most violent altercations occurred, each sect endeavoring to prevail over others. East side was determined to best the other.

Answer for yourself: What avenue was chosen to win the debate?

Epistles and gospels and revelations were manufactured and in almost all instances fictitious names of supposed writers would be later fixed upon them to give them greater credibility. The names of Apostles or other persons high in Christian piracy were not looked upon in those days as they are now. Writings were being falsified consistently by fraction after fraction; all trying to promote their particular point of view. Unity was out of the question.

Dionysius of Corinth (170 A.D.) complained that his writings were falsified, but consoled himself by saying that the same thing (**falsification**) **was done with the "Scriptures of the Lord"** (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., iv. 23).

Answer for yourself: Did you hear that? The Christian historian Eusebius records for us that the New Testament Scriptures "were falsified"? Which ones? Can you tell when you read the New Testament?

There is a way, but that is not our discussion at present.

Mosheim, the Christian historian, says:

"There were a number of commentaries filled with impositions and fables on our Savior's life and sentiments, composed soon after his ascent into heaven, by men who, without being bad, perhaps, were superstitious, simple, and piously deceitful. To these were afterwards added other writings, **falsely ascribed to the most holy apostles by fraudulent individuals**" (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., Book i, century I., pt. ii., ch. ii.).

He also says that the early Christians fell into the "pernicious error" of "deeming it not only lawful, but also commendable, to deceive and lie for the sake of truth and piety."

"This vice early spread among the Christians. Of this no one will doubt who calls to mind the numerous forgeries of books under the names of eminent men, the Sibylline verses, and I know not what besides, a large mass of which appeared in this age (the second century) and subsequently. I would not say that the orthodox Christians forged all the books of this character: on the contrary, it is probable that the greater part of them originated from the founders of the Gnostic sects. Yet that the Christians who were free from heterodox views were not wholly free from this fault is too clear to be denied" (Ibid., Book i., century II., pt. ii., ch. iii.).

We should understand that "eye witnesses" to this forgery and falsification of New Testament documents, many in the first and even the second century, attest to such being done long before the canonization of the New Testament. We have first hand evidence that forgeries were being written promoting this and that fraction's views in the names of the Apostles, who in reality, had nothing to do with such writings. That means they did not believe such things quite often; neither did Jesus. Yet these are passed off in Apostolic names as if these teachings were accepted and espoused by Jesus and his Apostles. Sadly, many of these forgeries exist in the Canon of the New Testament today and you never knew it. That is one reason why there are conflicting "gospels" in the New Testament along with many doctrines which the historical Jesus and the Apostles never believed or taught. Non-orthodoxy becomes orthodoxy and you never knew it!

Answer for yourself: Is such falsification of documents in the Apostle's names along with other attested forgeries that ended up in the New Testament the work of the Holy Spirit? Can these teachings be trusted? Is there "truth" mixed up within them and how can one discern the difference? Do you even want to?

DOCTRINES, DOCTRINES, DOCTRINES EVERYWHEREWHAT IS THE TRUTH?

Besides the current Gospels bearing the Apostle's names in the New Testament at present, the following is a partial list of the books fabricated and in circulation in that age, in addition to the ones now in the New Testament. Many listed are presented in The Apocryphal New Testament (contains all the existing Gospels and Epistles of the early Christian Church), and many are no longer in existence but referenced in early Church documents. The Gospel of Paul, The Gospel of Peter, the First Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, Ignatius' Epistle to the Romans, his Epistle to the Ephesians, his Epistle to the Ephesians, his Epistle to Polycarp, the Gospel according to the Egyptians, the Epistle of Polycarp to the Phillipians, the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, the Sibylline Oracles, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of Perfection, the Gospel of Philip, another Gospel of Matthew, the Gospel of Judas Iscariot, the Gospel of Basilides, the Gospel of Thaddaeus, the First Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ, the Gospel of the Birth of Mary, the Gospel of Scythianus, the Gospel of Tatian, the Gospel of Life, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Andrew, the Gospel of Bartholomew, the Gospel of Eve, the Gospel of the Encratites, the false Gospels of Hesychius, the Gospel of Jude, the false Gospels published by Lucianus, the Gospel of Barnabas, the Acts of Peter, the Acts of Paul, the Acts of Peter and Andrew, the Acts of John, the Acts of Mary, the Acts of Andrew, the Acts of the Apostles made use of by the [Ebionites](#), the Acts of the Apostles by Leucius, the Acts of the Apostles used by the Manichaeans, the Acts of Paul and Thecla, the Preaching of Paul, the Preaching of Peter, the Doctrine of Peter, the Acts of Philip, the Acts of Thomas, the Acts of Barnabas, the Judgment of Peter, an Epistle of Christ to Peter and Paul, and Epistle of Christ produced by the Manichaeans, the Epistle of Themison, the Epistles of Paul to Seneca, the Epistles of Seneca to Paul, the Revelation of Peter, the Revelation of Paul, the Revelation of Bartholomew, the Revelation of Cerinthus, the Revelation of Stephen, the Revelation of Thomas, the Revelation of Moses, the Revelation of Esdras, the Protevangelion or Gospel of James, Thomas' Gospel of the Infancy of Jesus Christ, the Acts of Pilate or the Gospel of Nicodemus, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Epistle to the Magnesians, the Epistle to the Trallians, the Epistle to the Smyrnaeans, the Epistle to the Philadelphians (forgeries under the name of Ignatius), the Epistle to the Laodiceans (a forgery under the name of Paul), the Pastor of Hermas, the Gospel of Cerinthus, the Gospel of Marcion, the Gospel of Truth, the Gospel of Apelles, the Second Epistle of Clement to the Corinthians, the Gospel of Longinus, and Epistle of Jesus Christ to Abgarus, King of Edessa, and an Epistle of Abgarus to Jesus Christ.

Understand that the above is not all of the books of that time. Of many we have not even the names. I have mentioned, for examples, but thirteen books of Acts, whereas Fabricius made a collection of thirty-six (McClintock and Strong, [Acts of the Apostles](#), "spurious"). It was from such forgery and falsification as this, with its Gospel of Judas Iscariot, Gospel of Eve, and Epistles ascribed to Jesus, that our Four Gospels (which are themselves forgeries and but a part of the common stream) came. **Most of the books of that age were written to uphold or oppose particular doctrines**, as when our Gospel of John is said to have been written to refute the views of Cerinthus and the Nicolaitans (Irenaeus, [Adv. Haer.](#), iii. 11. 1). Paul had to warn the Thessalonians not to be troubled or misled by letters falsely purporting to be from him (2 Thess. 2:2), and cautioned them that every genuine letter would bear his signature. Those that do not carry his signature most likely are not his.

THE HIDDEN CONFLICT BENEATH THE PAGES OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...THE PETRINES VS. THE PAULINES VS. THE JOHANNINES

Answer for yourself: Did you know before now that the collection of writings called the New Testament contains conflicting views from three theological camps that existed in the first century; each of which denied the other? The sad fact is without this knowledge one reads the New Testament and tries to fit each "puzzle part" into the big picture so to speak. The result is a distortion of the picture and of truth as some of the "pieces" of theology

simply don't fit into the truth about Jesus of Nazareth or his followers or what they both believed to be "truth." But without a prior and substantial knowledge of Second Temple Judaism one reads the New Testament as if everything in it belongs to the story of Jesus. Simply said Jesus and his Apostles could not believe much that is taught in the New Testament and would consider it blasphemous.

As stated before just because something might be "new" to you and that you have never heard it taught before in your church, or never read of such, does not invalidate it as "truth." Before one says "I don't agree" one needs to evaluate what is being said and give such a fair hearing. That means you have to read and study yourself to see beyond your comfortable experience. To do otherwise makes one an authority based only upon his experience, and I dare say our experiences are often quite lacking as a validator of truth. To admit that a man or woman has 1% percent of all knowledge is ambitious to say the least. Quite often in that 99% of knowledge unknown to such a one can be opportunities unlimited to learn truth he at present does not possess. Humility is a vital part of learning and helps balance the natural instinct to defend what we currently know. We may think we have the "truth" because we have emotions tied to beliefs, but these beliefs can and often be shown to be erroneous. We must have faith in "truth" not our experience. Emotional validation is a poor substitute for "truth."

Not to the point at hand. While there was a great number of sects dueling for authority in the first century among "believers", three principal ones command the attention of the student, the Pauline, the Petrine, and the Johannines, or the followers of Paul, of Peter, and of John; a division which is maintained, in a measure, to this day. The Eastern or Greek Church preferred John (Soxomen, Eccl. Hist., vii. 19), and the Western, Peter. The later divided at the time of the Reformation, and the Roman Catholic body maintained the authority of Peter as the only lawful head, while the Protestants now follow Paul. The doctrines which Protestant clergymen preach so much (predestination, foreordination, sanctification, and similar ones) are Paulisms, Jesus never having taught them. The contrast between Peter and Paul raged fiercely in the early days immediately following Jesus, and each was vigorously supported by factions. Paul was the apostle of uncircumcision, and of the Gentiles; Peter, of circumcision and of the Jews. Paul wished to "carry Christ" to the Gentiles and still allow them to be Gentiles. Peter said if they become Christians they must also become Jews, be circumcised, and do as the Jews did in the ceremonial. In those days Paul was not recognized as a lawful teacher of Christianity, nor was he for more than a hundred years (Bronson C. Keeler, A Short History of the Bible, Kessinger Pub. Co, Montana, USA., p. 40). In those days, if Peter should come back to earth and advocate circumcision, baptism before every Sabbath and Festival, continuance of Temple sacrifice, and the strict observance of the Jewish ceremonial, he would not be permitted to preach in any Christian church, Catholic or Protestant. **People do not realize how far from primitive Christianity and the real beliefs and teachings of Jesus and the Apostles they have gone.**

Paul said, if any one, even an angel from heaven, preached any other gospel than he did, that person should be accursed (Gal. 1:8). You may not know this but Paul, in writing this verse, was writing against the Apostles and the Jerusalem Church! He claimed authority as an apostle equal to that of the apostles at Jerusalem. But they had been appointed by Yeshua in person, or, eleven of them had been, and they had elected a twelfth to fill the place of Judas (Acts 1:15-26). Peter superintending the process; while Paul had appointed himself; and for him to claim to be their equal was something to which they could not submit. That is why Paul defends his self-appointed Apostleship continually in his Epistles. Paul asked, "Am I not an apostle?" (I Cor. 9:1). And James and the other Apostles said he was not. Revelation (a Johannine and therefore an anti-Pauline work) says, referring to Paul, "And thou has tried them which say they are apostles, and are not, and has found them liars" (Rev. 2:2). Paul claimed that he and his followers were still Jews, even if they did not practice circumcision (2 Cor. 11:22 ff.), but Peter and his friends denied it, and Revelation, again thrusting at Paul, says, "I know the blasphemy of them which say they are Jews, and are not, but the synagogue of Satan (Rev. 2:9); and "them of the synagogue of Satan, which say they are Jews and are not, but do lie" (Rev. 3:9).

Answer for yourself: Hard to believe? Well you need to study something other than the biased and forged New Testament if you want the truth about the Early Church.

Paul conceded that he had caught some of his followers by being crafty and using guile (2 Cor. 12:16):

2 Cor 12:16 16 But be it so, I did not burden you: nevertheless, being crafty, I caught you with guile.

The Strong's Number for guile is #1388 dolos- craft, deceit, guile

In an Epistle generally acknowledged of Pauline authorship we find his self-admission of being deceitful in teaching Christ.

Answer for yourself: In Paul spreading "his gospel" do you think the Holy Spirit approved of his "deceit"?

Paul thought that if he had misrepresented as to his apostolic authority, since good had come of it, no harm had been done. I wonder if God believes the end justifies the means?

"For if the truth of God had more abounded through my lie unto His glory, why yet am I also judged a sinner?" (Rom. 3:7).

Paul's early spirit as a persecutor appears when he wishes that those anti-Paulines who troubles the Galatians were cut off (Gal. 5:12). He once met Peter in Antioch, and an open conflict occurred (Gal. 2:11-21). Contrary to redactions history in the New Testament Peter was right and Paul wrong! Paul was teaching against the Covenant stipulations for non-Jews and when the men from James appeared the Church disbanded and left Paul alone.

The Ebionites, one of the most powerful of the early sects, rejected Paul, and said he was an apostate from the law (Irenaeus, Adv. Haer., i. 26). The Clementine Homilies attach him bitterly under the name of Simon Magus. They reject his Epistles entirely. Justin Martyr rejected him, and scarcely made notice of his writings. Hegesippus would not use his Epistles, and said, substantially, that he had falsified Scripture (Davidson, Canon, 115). Whether you know it or not Paul consistently misquotes the Old Testament for his advantage. Those not well versed in the Jewish Scriptures seldom notice this since the Septuagint is a purposeful mistranslation of the Jewish Masoretic Text by the Greek-Jewish Pythagorean and Buddhists of Alexandria, Egypt, and the Septuagint served as the base for Paul's quotes. Rather strange that Paul would misquote the Jewish Scriptures that Jesus used as taken from the Hebrew don't you think? The Paulines, on the other hand, rejected the Epistles to the Hebrews, which Christians now attribute to Paul, and they also rejected Revelation (Ibid., 118).

The followers of Valentinus were Paulines (Clem. Al., Strom., viii. 17), as were those of Marcion; those of Basilides were Petrites (Ibid.,). The Cerinthians opposed St. John (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 273) as well as Peter and Paul (Epiph., Haer., xxviii. 2-4).; the Simonians opposed Peter (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 273), the Ophites rejected St. John and St. Paul (Ibid., p. 282). They were snake worshippers (Webster's Unabridged Dict., "Ophite"), and claimed to have derived their doctrines from James the brother of Jesus (Hipp. Haer., v. 7). Another sect, the Donatists, held that there were no virtuous people in the Christian church except such as belonged to their sect, and required all who joined them to be re-baptized (Webster's Unabr. Dict., "Donatism"). Jerome was bitterly hostile to Origen's views, even accusing the latter, substantially, of heresy (Ency. Brit., "Rufinus"). Rufinus adopted Origen's theories, and Jerome, who had been Rufinus' dearest friend, loaded him with the most terrible reproaches, until the quarrel became the scandal of the Church in that time (Ency. Brit., "Rufinus").

It sounds strangely to hear persons in these days express a desire to "return to primitive Christianity, when all was peace and love." There never was such a time. Therefore, understanding the above, one must understand that within the New Testament are competing and conflicting sect's beliefs all rolled into one and the average Christian reads the "whole" of the New Testament as if this was given by God and tries to fit the conflicting pieces in one whole theological system. Thus many current beliefs held by Christians are simply wrong and unfortunately one's conduct is often determined by such false beliefs and forgeries and you never know unless you study. **We have fallen that far from the faith of the early Jewish believers who knew Yeshua personally and what he truly taught.**



THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT WHICH AT FIRST WERE NOT CONSIDERED INSPIRED

As in the case of the Old Testament, so in that of the New Testament, when the books composing it came into the world they were not considered inspired. They were looked upon the same way other books are. No one thought of calling them the word of God. The Old Testament was considered by the early Christians as inspired, and for two or three centuries after Jesus it was their only Bible (Westcott, Canon, 55). The first instance of the canonization of any of the New Testament books was about 170 A.D., when, in the Second Epistle of Peter (2 Peter 3:16), Paul's epistles are regarded by some as if Scripture, and that was simply a bothersome recognition of Paul after the long quarrel between the friends of himself and of Peter (Davidson, Canon, 134). For a century and a quarter after the death of Jesus the New Testament was not recognized to be as authoritative as the Old Testament (Westcott, Canon, 179; Davidson, Canon 122). And when Paul said, "The Holy Scriptures are able to make wise unto salvation through faith which is in Jesus Christ" (2 Tim. 3:15), he meant exclusively the Old Testament (Westcott, Canon, 55.) Previous to the year 170 A.D., wherever the early Christian Fathers used the phrase "Scripture" or "It is written," they always meant the Old Testament (Davidson, Canon, 119). The name "New Testament" was first given to the collection by Tertullian (Adv. Prax. 15), about the year 210 A.D., and the collection then laced many books which are in it now. The word canon, as signifying a list of authoritative Scriptures, was not used till Origen's time (Davidson, Canon, 4). The word "canonical" was used first in the decree of the Council of Laodicea (Ibid., 5), about 363 A.D. The word "Bible" was first applied to the books collectively by St. Chrysostom in the fifth century (Westcott, Canon, 438). New Testament copyists felt at liberty to change the language to suit their own ideas by taking out texts and inserting new ones (Tischendorf, "When Were Our Gospels Written?" Religious Tract Society's authorized edition, London, 1869, p. 15). Prof. Davidson says:

"Papias (150 A.D.) knew nothing, so far as we can learn, of a New Testament Canon...He had no conception of canonical authority attaching to any part of the New Testament. His language implies the opposite, in that he prefers unwritten tradition to the Gospel he speaks of. He neither felt the want nor knew the existence of inspired Gospels" (Davidson, Canon, 123).

"It is clear that the earliest Church Fathers did not use the books of the New Testament as sacred documents, clothed with divine authority, but followed for the most part, at least till the middle of the second century, apostolic tradition orally transmitted" (Ibid., 136).

"One thing appears from the early corruption of the sacred records spoken of by Irenaeus, Origen, and others, that they were not regarded with the veneration necessarily attaching to infallible documents" (Ibid., 161).

"The conception of a Catholic canon was realized about the same time as that of a Catholic Church. One hundred and seventy years from the coming of Christ elapsed before the collection of the New Testament books assumed a form that carried with it the idea of holy and inspired" (Ibid., 136).

During the first half of the second century "the New Testament writing did not stand on the same level with the Old, and were not yet esteemed sacred and inspired like the Jewish Scriptures" (Ibid., 122).

"Justin Martyr's canon (150 A.D.), so far as divine authority and inspiration are concerned, was the Old Testament....In his time none of the Gospels had been canonized, not even the synoptics, if, indeed, he knew them all. Oral tradition was the chief fountain of Christian knowledge, as it had been for a century. In his opinion this tradition was embodied in writing, but the documents in which he looked for all that related to Christ were not the Gospels alone. He used others freely, not looking upon any as inspired" (*Ibid.*, 129).

"It is certain that they (the early Christians) believed the Old Testament books to be a divine and infallible guide. But the New Testament was not so considered. The latter collection was not called Scripture, or put on a par with the Old Testament as sacred and inspired, till the time of Theophilus of Antioch (180 A.D.)" (*Ibid.* 5).

Now the conditions are reversed. People in this age of the world believe the New Testament is inspired, but they do not believe the Old Testament is.

"Two things stand out most clearly-the comparatively late idea of a canonical New Testament literature, and the absence of critical principles in determining it. The former was not entertained till the latter part of the second century. The conception of canonicity and inspiration attaching to the New Testament books did not exist till the time of Irenaeus" (*Ibid.* 163).

"Not until the latter half of the second century (180 A.D.) did the present Gospels assume a canonical position, superseding other works of a similar character and receiving a divine authority" (Davidson, *Intro. N.T.*, ii 520).

"Along with this process (the union of Paulines, Petrines, and the other fractions, about the middle of the second century), and as an important element in it, the writings of the apostles and apostolic men were uncritically taken from tradition and elevated to the rank of divine documents. It was not the rise of new dissensions "within the church" which led to the formation of a Christian canon; rather the idea of a "Catholic Church" require a standard of appeal in apostolic writings, which were not invested with an authority that did not belong to them from the first" (*Ibid.*, 168).

Tischendorf, the great orthodox scholar, in speaking of the period of canonization, says:

"It was at this time....that the Church...began to venerate and regard as sacred the writings which the apostles had left behind them" (When Were Our Gospels Written?" The Religious Tract Society's edition, London, 1869, p. 95).

The phrase "began to regard as sacred" indicates that before that time that regard had not existed. Canon Westcott says:

"It can not, however, be denied that the idea of the inspiration of the New Testament, in the sense in which it is maintained now, was the growth of time" (Westcott, *Canon*, 55).

One of the most curious intellectual phenomena presented to the student of religious history is that of men admitting that the idea of inspiration is a growth, and still not perceiving the absurdity of supposing that inspiration is a fact. And yet, thousands of Christian theologians present it.

We find, then, that, among the early disputing sects, it became necessary to have some authoritative court of appeal, and when the Catholic Church began to establish itself and to require such an authority, its officials, the Christian Fathers, asserted that these new books were inspired, and the word of God. But it was said simply to have authority for the new doctrines. The Fathers did not limit themselves to the books now in the New Testament, but selected such as agreed with their adopted views. The restrictions in the number of books were made later, and thus our present Bible was formed. But the Bible did not form the beliefs. The beliefs formed the Bible. Only such books were accepted in the New Testament as advocated the previously entertained dogmas. And the idea of inspiration passed over from the Old Testament to the New, by reason of associations, proximity, and similarity of use.



WERE THE CHURCH FATHERS COMPETENT TO DECIDE THE BOOKS OF THE NEW TESTAMENT?

Answer for yourself: Have you ever stopped and considered the competency of the early Church Fathers especially in light of the fact they you trust them today to have selected and preserved the Word of God in the New Testament for you which you are staking your eternal life upon? Have you ever studied out what they wrote or said in their writings? Were they competent for the task? Can we see the Holy Spirit in what they said and did?

Answer for yourself: Have you ever invested your time to personally inquire into these issues, or have you like most just taken the New Testament as handed down from these men for millennia and accepted it without question because of "church tradition?"

Most likely you haven't. Few have I find out as most Christians have implicitly been taught to accept that the Holy Spirit led these men in the selection of the books in the Christian New Testament. Maybe you are beginning to doubt somewhat; especially since reading these articles you have seen that most likely the apostles of Jesus had little if anything to do with the writing of the Gospels which carry their names.

It never ceases to amaze me how the Protestant, who refused to be a Catholic and disbelieves Catholic dogma and doctrine, readily accepts the Catholic Bible as it was these same men who were given these "doctrines" supposedly by the Holy Spirit who put together, added to, and deleted from the New Testament supposedly by the same Holy Spirit. Thank goodness that the New Testament is correct but the doctrines of the men who put it together are wrong. It just seem ridiculous does it not?

QUALIFIED FOR THE TASK?...YOU MUST DECIDE...BUT KNOW THE FACTS FIRST

Since the early Christian Fathers originated the theory that the books of the New Testament are inspired, the question arises, "Where they competent to do so?" The popular idea is that they were learned, profound, venerable men, worthy of the highest respect; and so vigorously has this been enforced, that one of the charges on which Servetus was burned to death by John Calvin was that he had spoken disrespectfully of the Fathers ("Servetus and Calvin," by R.Willis, M.D., London, 1877, p. 308). The facts are quite the reverse. The early Christian Fathers were extremely ignorant and superstitious; and they were singularly incompetent to deal with the supernatural. The men who laid the foundation of the canon were Irenaeus (200 A.D.), Clement of Alexandria (210 A.D.), and Tertullian (220 A.D.), and of them Prof. Davidson says:

"The three Fathers of whom we are speaking had neither the ability nor inclination to examine the genesis of documents surrounded with an apostolic halo. No analysis of their authenticity and genuineness was seriously attempted....The ends which they had in view, their polemic motives, their unclerical, inconsistent assertions, their want of sure data, detract from their testimony.

Their decisions were much more the result of pious feeling, biased by the theological speculations of the time, than the conclusions of a sound judgment. The very arguments they use to establish certain conclusions show weakness of perception" (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, 156 ff).

"The infancy of the canon was cradled in an uncritical age, and rocked with traditional ease. Conscientious care was not directed from the first to the well-authenticated testimony of eye-witnesses. Of the three Fathers who contributed most to its early growth, Irenaeus was credulous and blundering. Tertullian passionate and one-sided, and Clement of Alexandria, imbued with the treasure of Greek wisdom, was mainly occupied with ecclesiastical ethics....**(Their) assertions show both ignorance and exaggeration"** (The Canon of the Bible, 155).

LOOKING AT EXAMPLES OF THE ABOVE....

Some citations will illustrate for you the mental characteristics and competency of those who selected and chose for you a "new" Bible that replaced the one Jesus used.

You should be familiar with the fable of the phoenix, which was said to renew its life every five hundred years.

Clement of Rome (100 A.D.) thought it had an actual existence, and he asserted that it was typical of the resurrection (Ep. Ad Corinth, xxv. P. 123). Tertullian believed the same thing (De Resurrect., 13, vol. 2., p 236). Celsus, the noted anti-Christian writer, used this fact to illustrate the credulity of the early Christians, and Origen defended the fable rather than accept the just criticism (Contra Celsum, iv. 98). The writer of the Epistle of Barnabas believed an ancient superstition that the hyena changed its sex every year, being alternately male and female (Ep. Barnabas, ch. x), that a hare had as many young as it was years old, that a weasel conceived with its mouth, that the reason why men should eat only animals with a cloven hoof was because the righteous people lived in this world, but had expectations in the next through reincarnation (Ep. Barnabas, ch. x). Justin Martyr (150 A.D.) believed in demons. He said that they were the offspring of angels who loved the daughters of men (Apol. ii, 5), that insane people (demoniacs) were possessed and tortured by the souls of the wicked who had died in their sins (Ibid., i. 18), and that this was a proof of the immortality of the soul.

Answer for yourself: Did you catch that? For Justin Martyr, one of the most important of the Greek philosopher-Apologetists in the early church, whose writings represent the first positive encounter of Christian revelation with Greek philosophy and laid the basis for a theology which we have been taught today, believed that mental illness was proof of the immortality of the soul?

And we accept the religious doctrines and replacement religion set forth by this man without question Sunday after Sunday. It look like his judgment is off quite considerably to me.

He even said angels eat manna (Dial., 57). Has he ever had lunch with them?

Athenagoras (168 A.D.) declared that the strong belief of Christians that angels have been distributed by the Logos throughout the universe, and that they were kept busy regulating the whole (Legatio pro Christ., x). Some of the angels loved the daughters of men, and fell, and thus were begotten giants, or demons (Ibid., xxiv). These last roamed about the world, performing the evil deeds peculiar to their natures (Ibid., xxv).

Theophilus (180 A.D.) said that the pains of women in child-birth and the fact that serpents crawl on their bellies were proofs that the account of the fall, as given in Genesis, was true (Ad Autol., ii 23).

Tertullian believed that the hyena changed its sex (De Pallio, 3), and that the stag renewed its youth by eating poisonous snakes (Ad Scap., 3), and that eclipses and comets were signs of God's anger and forerunners of national disasters (Ad Scap., 3), and that volcanoes were openings into hell (De Penitentia, 12), and that the volcanic condition was a punishment inflicted on the mountains to serve as a warning to the wicked (De Penitentia, 12), that demons sent diseases upon the bodies of men (Apol., 22), blighted apples and grain (Apol.,

22), and produced accidents and untimely death (De Anima, 57). He said that a corpse in a cemetery once kindly moved to make room for another corpse to be placed beside it (Ibid., 51).

Answer for yourself: Did you catch the above? We have been talking about the "big shots" in the history of early Christianity and it seems they were highly steeped in superstition more than truth. I don't know about you but how can you trust such a one with such judgment and beliefs for anything of a spiritual nature? This sounds more like X-files than the Holy Spirit.

Clement of Alexandria (220 A.D.) said that hail storms, tempests, and plagues were caused by demons (Strom., vi. 3), that credulity was necessary to render faith easy (Strom., ii. 6), and that events in the life of Abraham were typical and prophetic of arithmetic and astronomy (Ibid., vi 11). He kindly allowed that Jews and Gentile would have the gospel preached to them in hell thus accepting another sun-myth (Strom., vi. 6). Clement's imagination was naturally lascivious. His chapter on the immodesty of Pagan women in the bath (Paedag., iii. 5) betrays his hatred for the upper classes and shows that if a bishop in the Church could use such language, the early Christians of Alexandria must have been from the very lowest grades of society. While this indignant at the supposed wickedness of the heathen, he wrote a book so unseemly (Strom., iii) that the English editors did not venture to translate it, and in it he quotes probably more from the Bible than in any of his other books.

Origen (254 A.D.) said that the sun, moon, and stars were living creatures, endowed with reason and free will, and occasionally inclined to sin (De Princip., i. 7). He was not certain if the celestial orbs and their "souls" were created at the same time as their initial creation. The light emitted by them was not the reflection of the sun, but light from knowledge and wisdom as reflected from the Eternal light. He maintained the stars and planets had "free will" and that they were rational creatures because they moved in the sky (De Princip., i. 7). The sun, moon, and stars, according to him, were "subject to vanity" (De Princip., i. 7), and they prayed to God through his only begotten Son (Contra Celsum, v. 11).

Answer for yourself: Did you catch that? Again, I don't know about you but how can you trust such a one with such judgment and beliefs for anything of a spiritual nature? This sounds more like X-files than the Holy Spirit.

Famine, the blighting of vines and fruit trees, and the destruction of beasts and men, were all the work of demons (Contra Celsum, viii. 31).

Lactantius (325 A.D.) believed that demons entered men and injured them through the viscera, producing diseases and mental distempers (Epitome of the Divine Institutes, 28), but that the sign of the cross (from sun worship) would drive them away (Divine Institutes, vi. 27). Well, that makes me feel better.

Cyril of Jerusalem (386 A.D.). quoted from Clement the story of the phoenix, and declared that God had created the bird expressly to enable men to believe in the resurrection (Catech., xviii. 8). He said it was a wonderful bird; and yet it was irrational-it did not sing psalms to God, and it knew nothing of His only begotten Son (Ibid., 244).

Answer for yourself: Did you catch that? Again, I don't know about you but how can you trust such a one with such judgment and beliefs for anything of a spiritual nature? Of course the bird would not know of the Son of God had it existed in the first place; it was a bird in the first place!

St. Chrysostom (407 A.D.) believed the air was filled with angels (In Ascens., J.C.). Jerome (430 A.D.) believed just the opposite; that the air was filled with demons (Epis. To Ephes., iii.6).

St. Augustine's (430 A.D.) New Testament was the same as ours today. Now we begin to see conformity of New Testament texts after the influence of St. Augustine. The influence of St. Augustine in establishing the Bible was greater probably than any other Father or than any council. People now attribute to God what was really the work of one man. But when we really study the man his judgment is not to be trusted in anything let alone the selection of the canon or the creation of Christian doctrine of which he is credited. Just read this and think.

The incredible and very ridiculous stories related by Christian Fathers and ecclesiastical historians, on whom we are obliged to rely for information on the most important of subjects, show us how untrustworthy these men were. We have, for instance, the story related by St. Augustine, who is styled 'the greatest of the Latin Fathers,' of his preaching the Gospel to people without heads. In his 33d Sermon he says: 'I was already Bishop of Hippo, when I went into Ethiopia with some servants of Christ there to preach the Gospel. In this country we saw many men and women without heads, who had two great eyes in their breasts; and in countless still more southly, we saw people who had but one eye in their foreheads'" (Taylor, *Syntagma*, p. 52).

Answer for yourself: How can you trust such a man to determine for you what books are to be in your New Testament let alone the Bible? Did the Holy Spirit have an off day when St. Augustine preached to people with one-eye in each breast or when he preached to people without heads or who had only one eye in their foreheads, but yet led St. Augustine into all truth concerning the canon for us today? Is this man trustworthy and what about the vast other stuff he said, or does this information impugn every thing he ever said and wrote?

St. Augustine (430 A.D.) likewise believed in demons. They tried to deceive men by persuading them that they were g-ds (*De Civit. Del.*, viii. 22). They were called demons from the Greek "daimones" on account of their knowledge. To the early Fathers exact learning was devilish. Reading this web-page would make you a candidate for being declared "possessed."

Answer for yourself: Can you imagine that after reading what you just read?

St. Augustine also believed that there was also a class of satyrs and fauns called "Incubi," to whose lascivious attacks and sexual rape women were constantly subject. Hollywood would have loved this and in fact has made several movies about this phenomena. As if that was not enough he also believed that demons termed by the Gauls "Dusii" perpetrated daily the same uncleanness. He maintained that there was so much trustworthy evidence that to deny it was an impertinence (*Ibid.*, xv. 23). So real and so universal was the belief in these lewd spirits that, in 1894, Innocent VIII issued a Papal bull against these spirits. Incredible!

I THINK YOU GET THE POINT

The erroneous and grotesque beliefs of the Christian Fathers could be quoted until they filled a large volume, but these few will illustrate the intellectual condition of the ages which originated and transmitted the New Testament to us. It will be said that the Fathers were as good as their times. That can not be maintained. They were not even as good. **In short, the sum of the charge against the Fathers is that they were not competent to tell what was evidence of a fact and what was not.** They cited as evidence of a theory things which are not in the slightest degree such, and they would look directly into the face of evidence which established theories they did not endorse, and would still be unable to see that it was evidence. Now, if the Fathers were great scholars, like you have been led to believe, they would not have been so persistently in the wrong. They should have see the truth at least as easily as the others did; like the Jewish scholars and Rabbis for instance. What has become of the names and the memories of the men in those day who had the truth and stood up for the truth against such absurdity? Are they even yet called great? The Christian Church has been honoring the wrong persons.

Admitting, for the sake of argument, that these Christian Fathers were as great as their time, I deny that they or their age were competent to form a Bible for their age.

STUPID...BUT SPIRITUALLY INSIGHTFULL?...OH...COME ONE NOW!

But one apology has ever been made for these remarkable errors of the Fathers, and that is "spiritual insight." Christian defenders say that, while the Fathers were ignorant, stupid, limited in intelligence, and even superstitious, they were yet "gifted with great spiritual insight." This term signifies the possibility of perceiving something which does not exist and where it does not exist. It is synonymous with "unlimited credulity."

Not alone in nature, but also in literature, the Fathers were ignorant and unscholarly. Jerome and Origen were the only ones who could read Hebrew (Davidson, On The Canon, of the Bible, p. 170). Justin Martyr quotes from Jeremiah and calls it Isaiah (Apol. i. 54). Clement of Alexandria quotes as Scripture passages which are not in the Bible at all (Strom., ii 6). He quotes as Paul's, words which are not in Paul (Strom., vi. 5). In quoting from an opponent he would insert words not in the original (Strom., ii. 4), and he even does the same in quoting from the Bible (On Chastity, vii). Tertullian quotes as in Leviticus a passage not in that book (On Monogamy, vi.). He misquotes history (Strom., iv. 26). Tertullian cites as Isaiah a passage not in that book, but in Revelation (On Modesty, vi). Besides that he is frequently inaccurate in a great number of his quotations.

The Gospel writers, supposedly under the anointing of the Holy Spirit, committed the same blunders. The man who wrote the Gospel of Matthew attributes to Jeremiah (Matt. 27:9) a passage which is in Zechariah (Zech. 11:12-13). The writer of the Gospel of Mark attributes to Isaiah (Mark. 1:2) a passage which is in Malachi (Mal. 3:1). The early manuscripts insert the name of Isaiah as the authority but the later ones omitted it because it was such a clear error.

One curious illustration of this, and of how sacred books are formed, is seen in the excess of the Catholic over the Protestant Bible. The former has quite a number of books which are not in the latter; such as the two of Maccabees and the Song of the Three Children-which Protestants call the apocryphal Old Testament, but which Catholics consider as much the word of God as any other books. The ancient Jews did not consider these authoritative, and the Palestinian Jews did not include them in the sacred collection. The Greek Jews, however, thought more of them, and the Alexandrian Jews placed them in an appendix to the Greek canons as the end of their Bibles, the same as they used to be printed in our old Bibles. The early Christians of Africa could not read Hebrew; they had to use the Greek manuscripts, and as they saw the apocryphal books in the collection, they supposed they were a part of it. The result was that the early Bible-makers in the African church included the apocryphal books because they were not intelligent enough to leave them out (Davidson, On The Canon of the Bible, p. 83). St. Augustine included them because he found them there, and the Catholic Church retained them because St. Augustine did.

So, there you have a rather quick over-view on the competency of those who chose the books for the New Testament, added and subtracted books, added to them as well as took from them, edited them, and were responsible for the New Testament as we have it today. **Honestly, these accounts do not foster confidence.** The years of study invested by me has shown me the utter unreliability of the New Testament for one's faith and practice of such faith; let alone a plan of salvation for the world to come. It is my hope after your examination of our other web-sites where we detail the multiple errors, the purposeful misquotations, mistranslations, and verses lifted out of context from the Old Testament and show you how they were used completely in a different way in the New Testament along with supposed prophetic authority, that you are coming to see how the faith of Jesus was perverted by the early Gentile Church. This article is just another puzzle part for surely after reading this you should have many doubts about the competency of those who chose for you what was and was not God's Word, and those affiliated with the movements these men represented. Hopefully you are becoming more serious in your study into why we were given a New Testament in the first place; let alone be given a Bible that replaced the one Jesus read. Shalom.



THE CRITICAL AND CHRONOLOGICAL STUDY INTO THE CANONIZATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT...CAN THIS BE THE FRUIT OF THE HOLY SPIRIT?

INTRODUCTION

Now we come to the formation of the Christian canon; to the process by which it evolved. Again I bring to your attention what very distinguished men, like Brooke Foss Westcott D.D., D.C.L., honorary fellow of Trinity and King's College, at Cambridge, had to say to help us today understand how one should approach the New Testament writings let alone determine what kind of authority we should attach to such documents, especially in light of the prior existence of the Torah and the Tanakh, the Scriptures used by Jesus. As you read this information balance what you learn with the prior held beliefs "from Roman Church tradition" as to the importance of such documents.

Beginning with the first two centuries of the Christian Church, we find that there was no New Testament as we now understand that term.

More than forty Gospels and a much greater number of Acts, Epistles, and Revelations were in use by the Church corporate. The writer of the Gospel according to Luke says, "Forasmuch as many have taken to hand to set forth in order a declaration of these things," etc., showing that when he wrote many Gospels were already in existence. From the mass writings then in circulation, the books in our New Testament were taken, and the other books out of use (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 183).

Origen says:

"And that not four Gospels, but very many were written, out of which these we have were chosen and delivered to the churches, we may perceive" (In Proem. Luc., hom. I, vol 2. P. 210).

The selection of books, and the formation of the list, was a **very slow process**, and it is "impossible to point to any period as marking the date at which our present canon was determined" (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 496).

"This result (the formation of the canon) was obtained gradually, spontaneously, silently. **There is no evidence to show that any time the claims of the apostolic writings was to be placed on equal footing with the Old Testament, which formed the first Christian Bible,...this was deliberately discussed and admitted...** Step by step the books which were stamped with apostolic authority were collected from the other works which contained the traditions of less authoritative teachers" (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 345).

Answer for yourself: Did you understand that those who first collected such writing admitted among themselves and have passed down their own thoughts that these collection of writings were not intended to replace the Old Testament in authority...let alone be considered another "Bible?" But yet it regrettably has happened! We have added to the Word of God whether we want to admit it or not! It seems ridiculous to me today that we consider

documents as the "Word of God" then those who originally collected them did not!

What should immediately strike you is the fact that those who decided we need a "new book" were fully aware that such a collection was never to have the same authority for one's religious beliefs as did the existing Jewish Scripture...the Old Testament!

This is a very damaging quote from a most renowned New Testament scholar that impugns the integrity and the authority of the whole of the New Testament.

RELIGIOUS IN-FIGHTING OF THE VARIOUS EARLY CHRISTIAN SECTS ...WHOSE VIEWS WERE TO BE "INSPIRED" AND WHOSE NOT?

When the Catholic Church began to be formed, about the year 170-180 A.D., the tendency was to use fewer books, and the ones accepted as authoritative began to be called "divine".

Answer for yourself: Do you know what is the meaning to the word "divine?" There is a big difference between deity and divine. According to Webster's Dictionary the word "divine" means:

1. Pertaining to God, or to a heathen deity or false g-d,
2. Partaking the nature of God; g-dlike; heavenly; sacred; holy; excellent in the highest degree; apparently above what is human; relating to divinity or theology.

You should have noticed the glaring absence of any mention that "divine" means originated with God or comes from God. Nowhere in such understanding is room for a concept of "infallible, inerrant, or even inspired." Thus being so, and upon serious study, and in-depth analysis, one can quickly see how these documents which appear "g-dly and sacred" are exposed in their true colors....conflicting documents relating to theologies of various sects and their conflicting and competing dogmas...each intended for mastery over each other. The early church Fathers knew this; it is we who have approached these documents with false suppositions about their value and authority for our lives.

You should understand that the early Fathers originated the theory that these books were divinely inspired, and in another place that the heretics did so. There is no contradiction here. Both the Fathers and the heretics were Christians! They simply belonged to different sects. In the contest for the mastery it so happened that the sects to which the Fathers belonged...the Petrine...gained the supremacy, and from them arose the present Christian Church. Had the other sects gained the victory, their Fathers would now be the orthodox authorities and the others would be the heretics. Now, it is true that in the so-called heretical sects originated the **theory that the New Testament was divine and of equal authority with the Old**, but that doctrine would not have been accepted by us had not the orthodox Fathers of that time adopted it into their sects. We are the descendants of the orthodox sects, and so far as we are concerned the early Fathers originated the theory. **They did it to have authority for the new and unusual doctrines coming into use, just as the heretics were using the same theory to support their doctrines.** The books were, in those days, mainly in the hands of the bishops (Davidson, On The Canon Of The Bible, p. 164). The laity had nothing to do with them. Not one in ten thousand of the laity could read. **The recognition of the authority of the New Testament was brought entirely by ecclesiastical usage** (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 185).

As you read the next sentence fully understand the impact of such a fact. Each Father included in the newly forming New Testament what books he liked and which promoted his positions, and excluded what he did not like. Sounds like God to me! The consequence were to be expected; there were as many Bibles in those days as there were Fathers engaged in making them. In their differences of opinion as to what constituted the canon, the Fathers made no attempt to compare the books by a critical investigation into the history of the records

themselves (Ibid., p. 406). Dr. Westcott says the canon was "formed by instinct and not by argument" (Ibid., p. 386). Instinct is not a good thing to form a Bible by. The Fathers contended for centuries as to what should go into the list until they found they could not agree, and then the church held councils and voted on it, and the books which polled the most votes went into this "divine collection."

St. Augustine was a great advocate of this plan. He thought that the books which were received by all the churches should be in the Bible, and that in the case of books on which there was a difference of opinion, the majority voice of the churches should decide it (De. Doct. Christ., ii. 8). So in other words, according to St. Augustine, according to which fraction or sect that had majority power would come the determination which was "of God and what was not." This sounds right to me, how about you? In other words, what ever group had dominance and political, economic, and military power would flow the "divine oracles." I hope you have sense to understand the ludicrousness of such folly. Let me share another thing that was said by this distinguished man, St. Augustine. We have, for instance, the story related by St. Augustine, who is styled "the greatest of the Latin Fathers," of his preaching the Gospel to people without heads. In his 33d Sermon he says:

"I was already Bishop of Hippo, when I went into Ethiopia with some servants of Christ there to preach the Gospel. In his country we saw many men and women without heads, who had two great eyes in their breasts: and in countries still more southly, we saw people who had but one eye in their foreheads" (Rev. Robert Taylor, Syntagma, p. 52).

Now I ask you, is it wise to follow anything from such a man as this? Surely this should be enough for you to want to seriously begin a study into the men who decided what you believe today for your Eternal Life!

An exact parallel to this is found in the manner of making changes in the recent New Testament revision. On the first reading of a disputed text a majority vote authorized the amendment, but on the second and final reading a two-thirds vote of all those present was necessary (Revised New Testament, Preface, II. fifth rule of May, 25, 1879). **But even this plan did not work satisfactorily in the church, for the councils whom you were taught to believe were led by the Holy Spirit in the selection of these books differed continually for centuries! Quite often such disagreements on Heavenly things ended in wholesale murder of bishops by bishops.** It seems like God cannot make up His mind let alone infill those making such monumental decisions for all mankind with the fruit of the Spirit. One council as led by the Holy Spirit would adopt a list inserting books which another rejected, and rejecting books which another had inserted, and this continued over and over and over again until the church held one great council which adopted a summary final list which even contradicted itself. The ultimate capstone of such religious bickering and folly was summed-up by the the final ecclesiastical order that has poisoned all of Christianity even to this day:

"This is the Bible. Believe it or be damned."

Thus Christianity has become an exclusive religion that is ingrained by such a tenant which mandates belief in these conflicting and contradicting documents for one's Eternal life; such documents which can be shown to be paralleled to Gentile paganism no less. Why not find out what Jesus really believed about Eternal Life and what was really the Bible for him, and adopt his religious belief system as yours? I would think that as a Christian you would want to do that. Well, this is but the introduction to what I will show you as we begin a serious study into the formation of the New Testament and the role of the Holy Spirit within it...if He had one at all. You will have to be the judge, but you need to know the facts in order to make an intelligent decision on the matter.



THE INFLUENCE OF MARCION UPON THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE FIRST COLLECTION OF NEW TESTAMENT BOOKS....MARCION

The first collection of New Testament books ever made was by Marcion, called "the heretic," about the year 145 A.D. (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 308). It consisted of one Gospel and ten of Paul's Epistles (Tertullian, Adv. Marc., v.), and **they were not then considered the word of God.**

"Faith is the divine authority or inspiration of current books had not yet arisen...[Marcion] did not consider Paul's Epistles inspired or of divine authority (Davidson, Intro. N. T., ii. 516-517).

You need to realize that this was seventy-five years after Paul was dead. The Epistles which Marcion accepted were Galatians, First and Second Corinthians, Romans, First and Second Thessalonians, Ephesians, Colossians, Phillipians, and Philemon (Davidson, Intro. N. T., ii. 516-517). He omitted First and Second Timothy, Titus, and Hebrews, which we have since called genuine and placed in the Bible. His Gospel has been the subject of much controversy, the orthodox people asserting that it was Luke's mutilated; and the unbelievers denying this, and asserting that it was the manuscript from which Luke's Gospel was subsequently made up. The facts are these: Marcion's Gospel had no name (Tert., Adv. Haer., iv. 2). **Indeed, as St. Chrysostom observes, none of the apostles affixed their signatures to the Gospels now bearing their names** (Hom. I. in Epis. Ad. Rom.). That was the work of the church long afterward, and we have simply the church's word that they are genuine. And thus we find that in Marcion's time, more than a century after Jesus was crucified, even if a Gospel by Luke were in existence, his name had not yet been attached to it.

Answer for yourself: If Marcion's Gospel was Luke's Gospel the question arises: "How does it happen that a heretic was in possession of a genuine Gospel before the church itself was?" That's a good one. The inference is plain. It was the Luke we would later have "re-worked" by the Catholic Church how would later add the first three chapter which were missing in Marcion's Gospel. That explains all the errors and mistakes in these three chapters.

Answer for yourself: Marcion was considered later by the Catholic Church (when they were in authority) a heretic. Can you see that such branding of people as "heretics" was little more than saying that they disagrees with you? This is important when you read early church history because many who had the truth, like the [Ebionites](#), are branded by the Catholic Encyclopedia and early Catholic Fathers as "heretics." Understand this is nothing more than Gentiles disagreeing with Jews. The Jews automatically are deemed "heretics." These Jews, the Ebionites, just happened to be the first followers of Yeshua in the first century. Should such ones who knew him personally be called "heretics" by those who replaced the religion of Jesus with one of their own making?

Marcion's Gospel was identical, word for word, with about three-fourths of the present Gospel of Luke, and it was shorter than Luke. Now, you should know how annotations made on the margin of a manuscript find their way into the text in the process of coping, and this in time increase the length of a work, so that of two

manuscripts of the same book, one shorter than the other, the shorter is generally the older. As I have said, Marcion's Gospel was the shorter. The charge has been made that Marcion purposefully mutilated Paul's Epistles and Luke's Gospel to suit his doctrinal needs. It originated with Irenaeus, and was repeated with great violence by Tertullian and Epiphanius, and has been reiterated by theologians ever since, until very recently orthodoxy itself began to admit that it is not true (Davidson, Intro. N.T., ii. 517). So far from Marcion being a "heretic," he included in his canonical list all that he considered to be genuine Christian books (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 311), and he gives indications of having been a much more careful scholar than his accusers. **This is the irony of redactionist history by those who come to power and rewrite history to their own liking.** The Epistle which we now call "to the Ephesians" Marcion called "to the Laodiceans" and prided himself on restoring its true name (Tert. Adv. Marc., x. 17). He omitted from his Gospel the parable of the prodigal son (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 312), and from the Epistle to the Romans chapters 9-11 as well as the last two chapters (Origen, Comm. In Rom., xvi. 25), **either because they were not there in his time,** or because he was satisfied they were interpolations. Either way they were to be rejected. That means, Paul did not write them, because Marcion being pro-Pauline, would have included them for his advantage against the Jews if they existed. That also means that favorite memorized passage by most Christians, Romans 9:10-11 was not in the earliest Romans and never written by Paul:

Rom 10:9-11

9 That if thou shalt confess with thy mouth the Lord Jesus, and shalt believe in thine heart that God hath raised him from the dead, thou shalt be saved. 10 For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness; and with the mouth confession is made unto salvation. 11 For the scripture saith, Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed. (KJV)

The passages were simply not in the original Romans in 150 A.D.!

Take a minute and let that sink in. This "easy believeism" and be saved passage was never in the original Romans written by Paul? So, who added it later? Are we believing doctrines that God never gave us or spoke? Does this bother you?

EXAMINING THE CHARGES AGAINST MARCION

Understand that Marcion has to be called a heretic today, or else we might seriously investigate his New Testament, or the omissions in it which we think today are given by God and which we live by instead of the Torah! THINK! One only needs to read Tertullian and see how he blasts Marcion. So again, the Catholics are right. Might makes right; it has for a long time. It will soon be time for the Catholic Church to fill in the blanks of Marcion's New Testament. Their anti-Semitic doctrines will become New Testament Scripture in less than fifty years from Marcion's New Testament. So understand, when you pick up an old history book or a current theology book, like I did in Seminary, and read that "so and so" is a "heretic," don't be surprised and understand that most likely they had the "truth" once. You need to read and study to see for yourself. Dear ones, "orthodoxy today" is "unorthodoxy in the first century;" and "unorthodoxy today" is quite often found to be the beliefs of Jesus and the original church. May God forgive us for changing and then neglecting His true Word; the Jewish Palestinian Masoretic Text...the Tanakh. Now before you say you have it in your Old Testament in your Christian Bible, you need to set down for this. It is a blatant and purposeful mistranslation full of hundreds of misquotations affecting doctrine which was done by Greek-Jews of Phythagorean/Buddhist persuasion in the second century B.C.E. More on that elsewhere in this web-site. You need to see the evidence for yourself. I have and provide it for you. It is time to get back to the Bible Jesus used!

Some of the illustrations of the charges against Marcion will indicate their worthlessness character. In Seminary we were enamored with the early Church Fathers. When their names came up you could hear the "oohs" from those who revered them, yet had never read them. At one time that was me included. Such is power of tradition! Well, a lot of time and little reading will enlighten the blind!

We trust these men's doctrines and their writings; all the while believing they knew what they were doing under the inspiration of the Holy Spirit. Tertullian will do great damage to Marcion in his writings. He will almost single-handedly convict Marcion for all time of editing "out" much of the "supposed existing New Testament." Tertullian (220 A.D.) says Marcion eliminated from Luke's Gospel the sayings of Jesus that he came not to destroy the law and the prophets, but to fulfill (Adv. Marcion, iv. 7).

Answer for yourself: Did you see a problem with that?

That passage is not in Luke, but in Matthew (Matt. 5:17), yet Tertullian actually repeats this charge on three subsequent occasions (Adv. Marcion, iv. 2, iv.12, iv. 36). Maybe Tertullian should read the Gospels before he comments on them or corrects another about them. Tertullian goes on to say that Marcion must have expunged "I am not sent but unto the lost sheep of the house of Israel," and "It is not meet to take the children's bread, and give it to the dogs" (Ibid., iv. 7). These also are not in Luke, but in Matthew (Matt. 15:24-26). **The charge that he mutilated the canonical list, and those books which he accepted, will not stand.**

There is another noteworthy thing to note: **No writer before Marcion's time makes mention of the Gospel according to Luke, and no writer after him does so till Irenaeus, nearly fifty years later. These are the facts.**

Many think these facts are sufficient to give ground for suspicion that some one after Marcion took Marcion's "unnamed Gospel" and forged Luke's name to it. Yep! You will have to decide for yourself.



THE INFLUENCE OF IRENAEUS UPON THE FORMATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Irenaeus was the true founder of the New Testament canon. His date is from 180 to 200 A.D. **Understand that before Irenaeus we find no mention of the Gospels by name by those who quote or reference passages which would later be included in them.** Of our Gospels Luke was probably compiled or written about 170 A.D., Mark about 175 A.D., John about 178 A.D., and Matthew about 180 A.D. **Irenaeus began to use them within a very short time after their origin, though it was probably not until the year 200 A.D. that he knew of them all.** He used them exclusively, and his canon consisted of the Four Gospels, Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul (rejected Hebrews), First John, and Revelation (Davidson, The Canon Of The Bible, p. 138. In an appendix he placed as of less authority, Second John, First Peter, and the Shepherd of Hermas (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, 138). The Epistle to the Hebrews, Jude, James, Second Peter and Third John he ignored (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 138). **You should take note that this is the first time we meet with anything like a recognition of our present canon; and Irenaeus rejected several books which we not call divine.** As he is the earliest writer to mention the Four Gospels, orthodox theologians now assert that they **must have been** in use before, and recognized as sources of authority; because, they say, it would not have been possible if, as unbelievers assert, other Gospels had been in use before, to discard those others that to substitute a new series in their place. Ha! **The reply to this is, that it was not only possible, but it is what occurred, as history testifies.** Long before we received the "Four Gospels" hundreds of different "gospels" were in wide circulation through the empire. The intense rivalry between the different sects in the first two centuries, and especially between the **Paulines, the Petrites, and the Johannines**, had taught them that neither could master the other, and neither could hold exclusively to its sacred books, and insist on their adoption. The result was compromise, just as in a presidential convention, when the friends of the leading candidates find that neither of the favorites can be nominated, they unite on an entirely new man, one who before has hardly been mentioned. **The Catholic Church was just forming (about 170 C.E.), by the union of the small sects and churches into one great body, and the necessity of some written source of authority, of a Bible recognized by all, was apparent; and it was this need which formed the canon** (Davidson, The Canon Of The Bible, p. 134, 136, 164). The old books were discarded or suppressed, and the new ones took their place. In case you missed, it political necessity was the reason for the New Testament; to give credibility and authority for the new religion what was to go by the name of Jesus which would be centered in Rome. Sounds like God to me!

Previously no two sects had used entirely the same books, and many used only one; and this was true even for a long time after our Four Gospels came into use, and after the effort was made to form one universal canon. Diversity and confliction doctrines and dogma was everywhere. The Holy Spirit really had a problem to deal with. But did he?

CANONS, CANONS EVERYWHERE

Thus the **Ebionites** (Iren., Adv. Her. 1.26) and the Cerinthians (Epiph., Her., xxvii, 5; xxx, 3, 14) used only the St. Matthew; the Cordonians only Marcion's Gospel (Pseudo-Tert. Adv. Om. Her., vi). The Marcionites used, of course, only their own Gospel. The Theodotians rejected St. John, as did also the Alogi (Blunt, "Dictionary of

Sects," Alogi); and the Petrine Christians naturally preferred Mark's Gospel, which was Petrine (Tert. Adv. Marc., iv. 5), just as the Paulists preferred Luke, which favored Paul (Tert. Adv. Marc., iv. 5). **In the midst of these facts church strength could come only in union and in the adoption of books which should be acceptable to all.** Unity was necessary at all costs. That the New Testament is such a compromise its contents attest to the critical eye (or should at least if you read deeply and with a critical eye). The Gospel according to Matthew is Petrine, it being there that Jesus is represented as saying to Peter, "Upon this rock will I build my church" (Matt. 16:18). Mark is also Petrine and Luke is Pauline, as the early Christian Fathers testify (Tert. Adv. Marc., iv. 5). The Epistles of Peter are Petrine, the Epistles of Paul are Pauline, and the Gospel according to John, the Epistles of John, and Revelation are, of course, Johannine. You should take note that history at this time records the suppression of the old Gospels and the substitution of the new.

Thus, Serapion, Bishop of Antioch (190 A.D.), while on a visit to the church of Rnossus, in Cilicia, found them using the Gospel of Peter. Being appealed to, he permitted them to read it, notwithstanding the controversies it produced. Later he wrote: "But when I came to you I had supposed that all held to the true faith; and as I had not perused the Gospel presented by them under the name of Peter, I said, 'If this be the only thing that creates difference among you, let it be read.' But now having understood, from what was said to me, that their minds were enveloped in some heresy, I will make haste to come to you again" (Euseb., Ecc. Hist., vi. 12). Eusebius has preserved this extract, and though he does not say in so many words that the Gospel was suppressed, he intimates it, and it is conceded by eminent writers that that was done (Lost and Hostile Gospels, S. B. Gould, p. 245).

THE TESTIMONY FROM THE FIFTH CENTURY

Again, early in the fifth century there was a man named Theodoret who was actively engaged in superintending the establishment of churches. In his travels he found the Diatessaron, or Gospel of Tatian, in used in orthodox churches, and he wrote:

"I found also myself more than two hundred such books in our churches which had been received with respect; and having gathered all together, I caused them to be laid aside, and introduced in their place the Gospels of the Four Evangelists" (Theod. Haeret. Fab., i. 20).

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that in the fifth century he refers to "churches" (plural) which, in place of the Four Gospels we are acquainted with as if written by the Apostles, had hundreds of others? Is there a message from God in these that the earliest believes understood that we have been deprived of today?

These churches had over two hundred different books and gospels which we don't have at present and were content with reading them instead of what we have today

Answer for yourself: What does that tell you? Evidently the Holy Spirit had not witnessed to them as well as thousands and thousands of others that they needed "new books" and were missing the only "four" gospels that really mattered! Oh by the way, they also had the Bible Jesus used....the Old Testament!!!!

As late as the fifth century one whose commission was the oversight and establishment of churches makes mention that there were over two hundred competing gospels accepted by the churches (plural) and they were at this time without the Four Gospels we think were from the beginning of the Apostolic movement. **We could not be further wrong in our beliefs about the acceptance of the Canon even as late as the fifth century. Evidently the Holy Spirit had not witnessed this to all as of yet as we suppose!**

Answer for yourself: Were these people "saved" without this New Testament message from these "new" books which we feel preach is crucial for salvation?

Dr. Westcott says that "from this statement it is clear that the Diatessaron was so orthodox as to enjoy a wide ecclesiastical popularity" (Westcott, Canon, p. 320).

Answer for yourself: Did you church read or study from the Diatessaron last Sunday as the early churches did?

The fact of displacement is also recognized by Prof. Davidson:

"Not until the latter half of the second century did the present Gospels assume a canonical position, superceding other works of a similar character, and receiving a divine authority" (Davidson, Intro N. T., ii. 520).

I should be quick to add such authority was attested to those who promoted these "Four Gospels" over all others which were then accepted and read in the vast majority of churches at that time. There was no standard at this time for everyone decided what was to be accepted as "divine oracles" and this varied by location and city. Everyone and every group was an authority unto themselves.

When, therefore, the orthodox clergy asks if it were possible that other Gospels could have been long in use in the early church and then have been suppressed and succeeded by our present Gospels, the reply is, "That is exactly what occurred."

WHY FOUR GOSPELS.....?

Answer for yourself: But why should there be just four Gospel? Why not five, or six, or a dozen, or a hundred?

Irenaeus, who was, as I have said, the real founder of the canon, and who spent his life in endeavoring to establish the Catholic Church and the New Testament determined this matter for all, and the church has followed one man and his decision in this matter. Whatever reason he gives, therefore, for the present number of Gospels, will be the reason why we have that number. Fortunately, he is very explicit on this point, and we know exactly what decided him. As you read his answer again I wish to prompt you to ask yourself is this sound like the work of the Holy Spirit in determining for the church for all time the number of Gospels.

Believe it or not, Irenaeus said that there was four quarters on the earth, and four universal winds (north, south, east, west), and that animals were four-legged, or four-formed, and therefore there should be four Gospels. His words are exactly on this matter:

"It is not possible that the gospels can be either more or fewer in number than they are. For, since there are four quarters of the earth in which we live, and four universal winds, while the church is scattered throughout all the world, and the 'pillar and ground' of the church is the gospel and the spirit of life, it is fitting that she should have four pillars breathing out immortality on every side, and vivifying men afresh....Therefore the gospels are in accord with these things...For the living creatures are quadriform and the gospel is quadriform...These things being so, all who destroy the form of the gospel are vain, unlearned, and also audacious; those (I mean) who represent the aspects of the gospel as being either more in number than as aforesaid, or, on the other hand, fewer'" (Adv. Haer., iii. x. 8 & 9).

Answer for yourself: Do you now feel comforted in knowing that the Holy Spirit led Irenaeus to determine for all mankind the number of the Gospels of Divine revelation in relation to the number of feet that animals possess?

Answer for yourself: What if the wind was not out of the South but South-East...could we add another Gospel?

And Irenaeus has the audacity himself to call us "unlearned." That is like the pot calling the kettle black. It has never ceased to amaze me as to the superstition and darkness possessed by those who today are revered as spiritual giants like the early Gentile Church Father are in many circles. The

more you read them and how they conflicted and disagreed with each other it is almost impossible to find the Holy Spirit's tracks in anything they did. A quick look at the doctrines they created that run parallel to their Council which determined the Canon is an eye-opening exercise to say the least. After reading the doctrines the these men created that run parallel with their selection of the Canon one find it almost to incredible to believe the Holy Spirit could have led them into all truth concerning the Canon but at the same time led them to develop and create blasphemous religious doctrines which Jesus neither believed nor his hand-picked followers taught.

There is no sadder spectacle in the intellectual world, than that of men possessed of really great mental possibilities, frittering away their time and their self respect in trying to make a superstition appear reasonable by explaining its absurdities in an illogical manner such as Irenaeus just did. He would have been better served by walking in the dignity of rational intellectualism rather than staggering alone in a blind stupor propelled by ignorant mysticism.

Those modern theologians who quote Irenaeus as a learned and great man, do not take kindly to his argument for the number of the Gospels; nor to the fact that he said that the ministry of Jesus lasted twenty years (*Ibid.*, ii. 22). And at the same time he was endeavoring to establish as of divine authority Gospels which said that Jesus' ministry lasted but three years?

Answer for yourself: Was the Holy Spirit asleep in Irenaeus' case? Can we believe anything he said?

We will pick up study concerning the formation of the Canon of the New Testament with the Muratorian Canon in the next article.



THE MURATORIAN CANON

The canon of Muratori is also called the Muratorian Fragment, after the name of the discoverer and first editor, L. A. Muratori (in the "Antiquitates italicæ", III, Milan, 1740, 851 sq.), the oldest known canon or list of books of the New Testament. The manuscript containing the canon originally belonged to Bobbio and is now in the Bibliotheca Ambrosiana at Milan (Cod. J 101 sup.). Written in the eighth century, it plainly shows the uncultured Latin of that time. The fragment is of the highest importance for the history of the Biblical canon. It was written in Rome itself or in its environs about 200; A.D. and probably the original was in Greek, from which it was translated into Latin. This Latin text is preserved solely in the manuscript of the Ambrosiana. A few sentences of the Muratorian Canon are preserved in some other manuscripts, especially in codices of St. Paul's Epistles in Monte Cassino. The canon consists of no mere list of the Scriptures, but of a survey, which supplies at the same time historical and other information regarding each book. The beginning is missing; the preserved text begins with the last line concerning the second Gospel and the notices, preserved entire, concerning the third and fourth Gospels. Then there are mentioned: The Acts, St. Paul's Epistles (including those to Philemon, Titus and Timothy; the spurious ones to the Laodiceans and Alexandrians are rejected); furthermore, the Epistle of St. Jude and two Epistles of St. John; among the Scriptures which "in catholica habentur", are cited the "Sapientia ab amicis Salomonis in honorem ipsius scripta", as well as the Apocalypses of St. John and St. Peter, but with **the remark that some will not allow the latter to be read in the church.** Then mention is made of the Pastor of Hermas, which may be read anywhere but not in the divine service; and, finally, there are rejected false Scriptures, which were used by heretics. In consequence of the barbarous Latin there is no complete understanding of the correct meaning of some of the sentences.

As stated above, the date of this canon is entirely unknown, but orthodoxy places it at the time of Irenæus (200 A.D.), again simply it recognized the Four Gospels, Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul, First John, Second John, Jude, and Revelation. It mentions the Wisdom of Solomon which is no longer in the Bible, among the New Testament books; speak approvingly of the Shepherd of Hermas, and says that the Revelation of John and the Revelation of Peter were accepted by the writer, although many were unwilling at the Revelation of Peter should be read in the churches. It does not mention either First Peter, Second Peter, First John, or James (Westcott, On The Canon of the New Testament, p. 527), all of which are not in the Bible.

As to the author, many conjectures were made (Papias, Hegesippus, Caius of Rome, Hippolytus of Rome, Rhodon, Melito of Sardis were proposed); but no well founded hypothesis has been adduced up to the present. It speaks of the Epistle to the Laodiceans, calls the Epistle to the Hebrews the Epistle to the Alexandrians (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 225), and says both were **forgeries**, passing under the name of Paul—a fact of which modern theologians are discretely silent, when they cite, as they do with so much exultation, this manuscript as "early evidence of the canon." You can judge for yourself how desperately the church was in need of support when, after a tremendous conflict, it is willing to accept as "early evidence" a manuscript whose date is at least one hundred an fifty to two hundred years after Jesus was crucified.

These facts are disconcerting if you ponder them. We are 170 years removed from the Great Commission issued by Jesus. We find that almost 200 years later we have not the finished book that one would think necessary for such a noble endeavor as the Great Commission. I challenge you to imagine for a moment Jesus commanding his Apostles to go into all the world with this "New Testament" message of salvation but ill equipped due to not

having the manual yet ready. What of those that perished without accepting the necessary messages of these books which we deem divine today?

I can just hear Jesus saying:

Matt 28:18-20

18 ..."All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

19 Go ye therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost:

20 Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you always, even unto the end of the world"...but look guys...I don't have the new Bible ready yet.... the Father and I will not be able to agree on what to give you guys as the new manual for salvation for well over 200 years yet."

Answer for yourself: Have you ever stopped to think that Jesus was incompetent for his role if he expected his followers to go without the proper message or the necessary books?

Answer for yourself: How were these disciples and Apostles to teach the nations, better yet what were they to teach if they could not agree on what to teach with so many conflicting Gospels and Epistles circulating in the first centuries of the Gentile Church?

Answer for yourself: Were the people deprived of these books "damned" without hope automatically because they did not have a New Testament with all is necessary beliefs contingent upon one's salvation?

Answer for yourself: Is this inability to decide upon what was "inspired" by the early church the work of the Holy Spirit, and if so, what does that do to our image and understanding of a perfect God who cannot make up His mind and speak to his people?

Hopefully your reason and intellect is such that you can see the folly of such inability to decide which books God had determined necessary for the salvation of the world. The investigation of the sequence of books being deemed "in" and "out" and "in" and "out" over the centuries does little to bolster the image of a God who leads a people let alone speaks to them.

John 16:13

13 Howbeit when he, the Spirit of truth, is come, he will guide you into all truth: for he shall not speak of himself; but whatsoever he shall hear, that shall he speak: and he will shew you things to come.

Well the Holy Spirit is evidently not guiding very good for several centuries. If you take the above passage from the New Testament seriously then God is out of His mind because He is evidently speaking one thing to one group at one time and a completely different and contradicting thing to another group at another time; even at the same times. We call that schizophrenia today and prescribe mind-altering drugs to cure such conditions.

A MUCH MORE SERIOUS QUESTION AWAITS YOUR CONTEMPLATION

Preserving the honor of God hopefully the Holy Spirit had little to due with this confusion in the canonization of the New Testament. What should trouble you is the inclusion into this "New Testament" of the various sects conflicting and competing theologies which today, not knowing the origin or the identity of them, one is relegated to reading the New Testament under the false notion that all is "inspired" and accepting such "beliefs" if they came from God. Let me give you a parallel. You go to the store and buy four puzzles consisting of a thousand pieces. You quickly go home and empty the pieces together into one jumble and then begin to fit

and force them into a frame that was meant to only handle one puzzle. You read the instructions on the box and they inform you that these pieces are "inspired" so with utter confidence you begin to force the pieces together and make them fit even when they won't. Needless to say the picture come out distorted and is not true to the original. This is what has happened by the continual jockeying for authority by sect after sect over hundreds of years as they got "their views and ideas" recognized as the Word of God through successive Church Councils. These "ideas" became literally Holy Scripture! You failure to understand the history of the Canonization of the New Testament and the selection of books by sect after sect has robbed you of the truth in understanding what validity and authority such a document might possess today. To stake your Eternal Life upon such a "power struggles" for supremacy by those fractions within the Gentile Church is not wise; especially in light of the knowledge you are now acquiring let alone a honest comparison of the teachings of the Jewish Bible vs. The New Testament. You might have never noticed by the New Testament contradicts the Eternal Word of God as found in the Jewish Tanakh in multiple places. Dear one, this means that the "jots" and "titles" that Jesus said were forever were nullified many places in the New Testament. You lack of awareness does not negate such; only study on your part will reveal this to you.



THE TESTIMONY OF THE THIRD CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA (210 A.D.)

Clement of Alexandria who lived in the early third century placed in his deuterocanon, as having inferior authority, Hebrews, Second John, Jude, which are not in the Bible, and the Revelation of Peter but not the Revelation of John. He also included the Shepherd of Hermas, the First Epistle of Clement, the Second Epistle of Clement, and the Epistle of Barnabas (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 139), which are not in the Bible. He thus placed the Epistle to the Hebrews, Second John and Jude, which are not in the Bible, on a level with the Shepherd of Hermas and the Epistle of Barnabas, which are not in the New Testament today. He recognized no distinct canon as of supreme authority (Ibid., 116), and he did not attach our idea of "uncanonical" as opposed to "canonical" to either of the Four Gospels or to any other books of the New Testament (Ibid., 139). Let us take time to see other information concerning [Clement of Alexandria](#) which helps explain his theological positions today in his writings and which explain his deviation from the "faith of the Jewish church."

TERTULLIAN (220 A.D.)

Tertullian included in his canon the Four Gospels, Acts, Epistles of Paul, First John, and Revelation (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 139). He placed in an appendix, as not authoritative, Hebrews, Jude, Second John, and First Peter (Ibid., p. 139), which are in the Bible now, and the Shepherd of Hermas, which is not; and he said nothing of James, Second Peter and Third John (Ibid., p. 139), which today are in the canon. Notice he is not in agreement with the Muratorian Canon established twenty years or more before his time. Again, every man was a "canon" unto himself.

THE PESHITO...OR PESHITTA

The Peshitta, that is, the "simple" (translation). This version has had such a complex literary history that its origin has long been a matter of debate. As far back as it can be traced, it has been a Christian version, since it contains the NT as well as the OT, and the extant copies of it have come from Christian hands. Yet the OT shows such a strong Jewish influence that many scholars hold that it was, at least in part, of Jewish origin, though some explain it as of Jewish-Christian origin. It may have been produced at Edessa, though Kahle states that it came from the region of Adiabene, lying east of the Tigris, where King Isates and his mother Helena became Jewish proselytes in the 1st cent. a.d. There are passages in the OT that are little more than transliterations of western Aramaic Targums into the Syriac script. **While the text agrees in the main with the Masoretic Hebrew, it seems to have been revised on the basis of the LXX.** Originally this Syriac version lacked Chr, Ezr, Neh, and Est, as well as the Apocrypha, all of which were added at a later date. The most valuable Syriac manuscript is the Codex Ambrosianus from about the 6th cent., now in Milan. A manuscript of Gen, Ex, Num, and Deut, from the monastery of St. Mary Deipara in Egypt, bears a date

corresponding to a.d. 464, and is thus the oldest copy of the Bible in any language bearing a definite date

According to the Encyclopedia Britannica, the Peshitta (Syriac: "simple," or "common") is the Syriac version of the Bible, the accepted Bible of Syrian Christian churches from the end of the 3rd century AD. The name Peshitta was first employed by Moses bar Kepha in the 9th century to suggest (as does the name of the Latin Vulgate) that the text was in common use. The name also may have been employed in contradistinction to the more complex Syro-Hexaplar version. Of the vernacular versions of the Bible, the Old Testament Peshitta is second only to the Greek Septuagint in antiquity, dating from probably the 1st and 2nd centuries AD. The earliest parts in Old Syriac are thought to have been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic texts by Jewish Christians at Edessa, although the Old Testament Peshitta was later revised according to Greek textual principles. The earliest extant versions of the New Testament Peshitta date to the 5th century AD and exclude The Second Letter of Peter, The Second Letter of John, the Third Letter of John, The Letter of Jude, and The Revelation to John, which were not canonical in the Syrian church.

Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 139, also attests that the Peshito, the Bible of Ancient Syriac Christians, omitted Second Peter, Second John, Third John, Jude, and Revelation, all of which are not in our Bible (Ibid., 146).

THE OLD LATIN VERSION

The Old Latin. The Latin rendering of the Bible probably originated in North Africa as early as a.d. 150. It is even possible that the Christians of North Africa adopted a translation of the OT from Latin-speaking Jews. Tertullian (c. a.d. 160 – c. 230) knew the Old Latin Bible at least in part, and Cyprian (c. 200–258), bishop of Carthage, quotes frequently from both Testaments of this Bible. Only fragments of the Old Latin of the OT have survived. Several of the Apochryphal books were incorporated unrevised into the Vulgate. As for the rest of The Bible, scholars have been able to piece together manuscript fragments covering a considerable portion of the OT. These, together with quotations in the early Latin Fathers, are our sources for the reconstruction of the Old Latin text of the OT. Scholars distinguish 2 types of text: the African and the European. The Old Latin of the OT was made from the Greek LXX, and its chief value today is as an aid in recovering the text of the LXX as it was before Origen's revision of it.

What is important for us to notice is that the Old Latin version, the Bible of the early African Church, omitted the Epistle to the Hebrews, Second Peter, and James. The Epistle to the Hebrews was added subsequently as an anonymous book (Westcott, On The Canon of the New Testament, p. 254). Again we see no unity or agreement with those who came before and their "opinions" as to what was "God-breathed."

THE ABYSSINIAN CHURCH AND ITS CANON

The Abyssinian Church was a church that believed in "monophysitism." This was a Christian schismatic sect of the 5th and 6th centuries that maintained that Christ had only one (divine) nature, thereby opposing the orthodox doctrine that he was both divine and human. The Monophysites were mainly confined to the Eastern church and gained little strength in the West. At the directive of Pope Leo I, the Council of Chalcedon in 451 attempted to steer a middle course between the orthodox and Monophysite views. The resulting edict did not satisfy the Monophysites, and the controversy continued, the Monophysites being supported by the Copts and the Eutychian sect. The Eastern church, in an effort to suppress the heresy, in the first half of the 6th century excommunicated the Monophysites, who thereupon formally seceded from the parent church. The Monophysites split into two factions over controversies regarding the incorruptibility of Christ's body. After 560 a third faction, the Tritheists, arose; they interpreted the three persons of the Deity as three separate gods and hence were regarded by the other factions as heretics. In Egypt, Syria, and Mesopotamia the Monophysite congregations remained strong throughout the controversy. Although finally condemned in 680-81, at the sixth ecumenical council, Monophysitism continues in some churches to this day. The modern Abyssinian church, Armenian church, Coptic church, and Jacobite church are all Monophysitic bodies.

The Canon of the Abyssinian Church included at first, Enoch (of course since it taught an Angel-Messiah and

not a human messiah), Fourth Esdras, the Ascension of Isaiah, the Jubilees, and Asseneth (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 206), books which are not now in the Bible and of several of which the world now never hears. The list was changed frequently, and many books were eliminated or inserted, but, generally speaking, it contained Judith, Tobit, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees, Wisdom of Jesus, Wisdom of Solomon, and even a book called the Apocalypse of Isaiah (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 206), none of which are not in our Bible.

UPPER AND LOWER EGYPT...AND ITS CANONS

The Bibles of upper and lower Egypt are called "Coptic" as in the Coptic New Testaments. Of some 5 known Coptic versions, the most important are the Sahidic and the Bohairic.

(1) The Sahidic.

This version is the older version and was used in Southern (Upper) Egypt. It was formerly designated Thebaic, after the city of Thebes. Only fragments of this version are extant, but these fragments are of sufficient quantity to reconstruct the major part of the NT. The earliest manuscripts originate from the 4th cent. a.d..

(2) The Bohairic.

This version was current in Northern (Lower) Egypt and eventually replaced the other dialects. It is the Coptic used to this day in the church services, and the complete NT has been preserved in it. Both the Sahidic and Bohairic versions of the NT contain principally an **Alexandrian** (again we find the Alexandrian influence) type of text, similar to a text such as is found in the Codex Vaticanus.

The two canonical lists of upper and lower Egypt, called the Thebaic version, or version of Thebes, and the Memphitic version, or the version of Memphis, omitted Revelation (Westcott, On The Canon Of The New Testament, p. 266).

ORIGEN

Origen (250 A.D.) included in his Old Testament list the Epistles of Jeremiah, First Maccabees, and Second Maccabees, which are not in our Bible, and he makes no mention of Hosea, Joel, Amos, Obadiah, Jonah, Micah, Nahum, Habakkuk, Zephaniah, Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi, which are in our Bible (Euseb., Eccl. History, vi. 25). The omission of these twelve books is very singular, and Rufinus' Latin version (400 A.D.) kindly inserts them. Even if they were omitted by mistake, the error shows how careless and indifferent the Fathers were in stating what books were in the Bible. Origen did not formulate a consecutive list of the New Testament books, but passages gathered here and there from his works indicate what his opinion was (Ibid., 261). He apparently divided the New Testament books into three classes, authentic, unauthentic, and uncertain. The first included the Four Gospels, Acts, fourteen Epistles of Paul, First Peter, First John, and the Revelation of John. The second included the Shepherd of Hermas, thought he was rather inclined to place it in a higher class, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Acts of Paul, the Gospel according to the Hebrews, the Gospel of the Egyptians, and the Preaching of Peter (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 146). The third class included the Epistles of James, Jude, Second Peter, Second John, and Third John (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 146), all of which are in the Bible today.

As you can see again over the next one hundred years there was little unity or agreement on "what" was the Word of God among the early Church. Now, let us continue.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE TESTIMONY OF THE FOURTH CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

EUSEBIUS

Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian (340 A.D.), divided the books of the New Testament into three classes, the "acknowledged," the "disputed," and the "heretical" (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., iii. 25). The "acknowledged" books included the Four Gospels, the Acts, thirteen Epistles of Paul (omitting Hebrews), First John, and First Peter. They were the books concerning which there was no controversy. The "disputed" books he divided into two subordinate classes; the "generally known and recognized by most," namely, James, Jude, Second Peter, Second John, and Third John, none of which are disputed now, so far as the laity ever hears; and the "spurious," including the Acts of Paul, the Shepherd of Hermas, the Revelation of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, the Teaching of the Apostles, and the Revelation of John, which last is in the Bible today, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews. The "heretical" books included the Gospel of Peter, the Gospel of Thomas, the Gospel of Matthew (not the one now in the Bible), the Acts of the Apostles by Andrew, and the Acts of the Apostles by John. The Epistle of James, which is not in the Bible and which he here classes as generally recognized, in another place he calls "spurious" (Euseb., Eccl. Hist., ii. 25), and of Revelation he says that possibly it should be among the acknowledged books, but that some rejected it. The idea as to what composed the Bible was in the minds of the Fathers vague and indefinite. Such a strict and unalterable rule as we now have they did not possess. Eusebius was a bishop of the Eastern church, and the reader will observe as we progress that the church uniformly discarded Revelation.

CYRIL, BISHOP OF JERUSALEM

Cyril, the Bishop of Jerusalem (356 A.D.), is a member of the Eastern church, made a catalogue which included the books now in our New Testament except Revelation, and he adds, "But let all the rest be excluded. And all the books which are not read in the churches, neither do thou read by thyself" (Catech. Lect., iv. 35).

THE COUNCIL OF LAODICEA...[150 YEARS LATER...LOCAL BUT NOT GENERAL AUTHORITY]

More than three hundred and fifty years passed away, and it became apparent that the Fathers could not agree as to what books should be in the Bible, and councils began to deal with the matter. The first Christian assembly at which the canon was made the subject of a special ordinance was held at Laodicea in 365 A.D. Tertullian indeed mentions the fact that synods had acted upon the canonicity of books in his time (Dr. Pudic, 10), but their authority much have been local and not general. Jerome also says that the council of Nicea included Judith in a list which it adopted (Pref. In Judith, i. p. 1169, Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 171), but I can find no good evidence that the council of Nicea acted on the canon at all, although there is a very

general impression that it did. The current tradition is that the books were placed under a table at Nicea, and that after prayer the canonical ones leaped out from under, and the others remained behind. It is said that this story is told by Pappus, a Lutheran divine (1549-1601) in his "Epitome Historiae Ecclesiasticae de Conversionibus Gentium," etc. It is, of course, fabulous, and probably originated from the fact that at the council of Chalcedon the Gospels were placed in the midst of the assembly (Westcott, Canon, 426).

The synod of Laodicea was not a general council of the church, but its list was afterwards adopted by the church, so that virtually that was the first general action on the contents of the Bible. It was a gathering of twenty-four to thirty-two (the number is variously stated) of the clergy of Lydia and Phrygia. Whatever the number, the so-called heretics had a majority of the votes present (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 173). Its decree was as follows:

"Psalms composed by private men must not be read in the church, nor uncanonical books, but only the canonical books of the New and Old Testament. How many books must be read::

Then follows the list as we have it today, except the omission of Revelation. This council is of importance because for the first time the tone of authority as to what must and must not be read is established.

ATHANASIUS

Athanasius, Bishop of Alexandria, (365 A.D.), was at enmity with Eusebius and the clergy of Laodicea (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 234), and when Laodicea declared that Revelation was not in the Bible, Athanasius immediately promulgated a list in which he declared that it was. In his canon he names, he says, the books in which alone were proclaimed the doctrines of godliness, and which no man must take from, and no man add to. Yet he omitted Esther, which the church has since added, and he also inserted Baruch and the Letter of Jeremiah, which the church has since taken away (Athanasius, Festal Epistle XXXIX, Liberty Of The Fathers, Oxford, 1954). He expressly declare that Esther was not a part of the Bible, and place it on a level with the Pastor Of Hermas, and a book called The Doctrine of the Apostles. He closed by saying: "Let there be no mention of apocryphal writings." He had become tired of the controversy.

AMPHILOCHIUS, BISHOP OF ICONIUM 365 A.D.

Amphilochius, Bishop of Iconium (365 A.D.), in his New Testament, accepts the Four Gospels, Acts, and fourteen Epistles of Paul, and adds, "But some maintain that the Epistle to the Hebrews is spurious; not speaking well, for the grace is genuine. To proceed: What remains? Of the Catholic Epistles some maintain that we ought to receive seven, and others three only, one of James, and one of Peter, and one of John...The Revelation of John again some reckon among (the scriptures); but still the majority say that it is spurious. This will be the most truthful canon of the inspired scriptures" (Lambi ad Seleucam). One cannot decide from the above what he considered "the most truthful canon," but it shows again how entirely unsettled was the question as to what was to be considered the New Testament and what was not, and that the question was purely a matter of individual opinion. His closing words show that in his time no list was universally accepted.

OPATATUS, OF MELA (370 A.D.)

Opatatus of Mela omitted Hebrews (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible,p. 193)

GREGORY OF NAZIANZUS (389 A.D.)

Gregory of Nazianzus (389 A.D.), gave as the New Testament the Four Gospels, the Acts, fourteen Epistles of Paul, and the seven Catholic Epistles, and he adds, "In these you have all the inspired books; if there be any book besides these, it is not among the genuine (scriptures)" (Carm., xii. 31). He belonged to the Eastern church, and he likewise rejected the book of Revelation.

By the "seven Catholic Epistles" is meant always James, First Peter, Second Peter, First John, Second John, Third John, and Jude. Why they are called Catholic Epistles no one knows (Kitto, Cyclo. Bio. Literature, "Epistles, Catholic,"). Any explanation of the name is an assumption.

ST. AUGUSTINE (390 A.D.)

St. Augustine's New Testament was the same as ours today. Now we begin to see conformity. The influence of St. Augustine in establishing the Bible was greater probably than any other Father or than any council. People now attribute to God what was really the work of one man. While councils decided upon the canon, and their decision became embodied sentiment of the entire church, the expression was really that of but one man, the leader in the council, and when doubts arose as to the authority of a book, scholarship was not involved to decide it, for the members possessed almost none. They simply asked: "What did the Early Fathers say of it?" Prof. Davidson says:

"In relation to the New Testament, the synods which drew up lists of the sacred books show the opinion of some leading Father like Augustine, along with what custom had sanctioned. In this department no member of the synod exercised his critical faculty; a number together would decide such questions summarily. Bishops proceeded in the track of tradition or authority" (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 172).

In 393 A.D. a council met in Hippo, in Africa, discussed the canon, and adopted St. Augustine's list. St. Augustine himself was present, and was the ruling spirit.

In 397 A.D. was held the third council of Carthage. St. Augustine was again present. It adopted a decree as follows:

"It was also determined that besides the canonical scriptures, nothing be read in the church under the title of Divine Scriptures. The Canonical scriptures are these:"

Then follow the names of the books of the Bible as we have them now, except some variations in the order

DIDYMUS OF ALEXANDRIA (392 A.D.)

Didymus of Alexandria tells us that Second Peter in his time was accounted spurious and was not in the canon, yet it was publicly read (Westcott, Canon, 444). In the early days books were read in the churches which were known at the time to be spurious and which were not in the canon. In time most of these books were to find their way into the New Testament. Today Second Peter is not only read in the churches, but is accounted genuine and is in the Bible. And if any modern orthodox minister, believing as the ancients did, that it was spurious, desired to say so, he would not dare to, since it would "unsettle the faith of his congregation." For this he would be dismissed, and his livelihood would cease as a minister and the support of his family through the ministry would stop. It is thus that ecclesiasticism compels men to play the hypocrite, and teach as true that they believe to be false. The same is done today; many times ministers know more than they let one and for the sake of their "check" play the party-line.

Let us continue.



THE TESTIMONY OF THE FIFTH CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

ST. CHRYSOSTOM (407 A.D.)

St. Chrysostom (407 A.D.) did not use Second John, Third John, Second Peter, Jude, and Revelation (Westcott, Canon, p.438), all of which are in the Bible now. He included the Wisdom of Jesus (Westcott, Canon, p. 438), a book which is not now in the Bible.

THEODORE, OF MOPSUESTA

He rejected the Epistle of James, Second Peter, Second John, Third John, Jude, and Revelation (Westcott, Canon, p. 438), all of which are now in the Bible.

THEODORET, BISHOP OF CYRUS

He rejected Second John, Third John, Second Peter, Jude and Revelation (Ibid., note 2).

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE GREEK BIBLE

There are three great manuscripts of the Greek Bible extant, the Sinaitic, the Vatican, and the Alexandrine. They are the high courts of appeal in all cases of disputed texts, and their lists are, therefore, very important.

The Sinaitic manuscript is one found by Tischendorf in a convent of St. Catherine, Mount Sinai, in 1859, and is probably the oldest of the New Testament codices in existence, dating back to the fourth century. It has the Four Gospels, the Fourteen Epistles of Paul, Acts, the Seven Catholic Epistles, Revelation, the Epistle of Barnabas, and a part of the Shepherd of Hermas (Westcott, Canon, p. 426), the last two of which are not in the Bible now.

The Vatican manuscript, in the Vatican Library at Rome, belongs to the middle of the fourth century. ; It ends by mutilation at Hebrews 9:14. Up to that point it agrees substantially with the Alexandrine manuscript (Ibid., note 2). What other books it may have contained one cannot say.

The Alexandrine manuscript, belongs to the fifth century, and written probably in Egypt, included in the New Testament the two Epistles of Clement (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p.10; Westcott, Canon, p. 544), none of which are in our Bibles at present.

CLERMONT CODEX

The Clermont Codex is a Latin manuscript now in the Imperial Library at Paris, and dating from the fifth to the eighth century, contains a list of the books read in the African Church in the third century (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 145). The New Testament omits Philippians, First Thessalonians, and Second Thessalonians, which are not in the Bible, and inserts the Shepherd of Hermas, the Acts of Paul, and the Revelation of Peter, which are not now in it (Westcott, Canon, 555). The Epistle which is now called "to the Hebrews" is there called the Epistle to Barnabas (Ibid., 557).

In 419 A.D. another council was held at Carthage., and St. Augustine's list was again ratified (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 199)

ON THE CHURCH'S COUNCILS...WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TOLD

The reader would err greatly did he suppose that in these assemblies one or two hundred gentlemen sat down to discuss quietly and dignifiedly the questions which had come before them for settlement. On the contrary, many of the bishops were ignorant ruffians, and were followed by crowds of vicious supporters who stood ready on the slightest excuse to maim and kill their opponents. The most shocking scenes that occur in the political conventions in the worst districts of our great cities and other nations are as nothing compared with what history tell us was common in these Christian councils. Dr. Phillip Schaff says:

"Together with abundant talents, attainments, and virtues, there were gathered also at the councils ignorance, intrigues, and partisan passions, which had already been excited on all sides by long controversies preceding and now met and arrayed themselves, as hostile armies, for open combat" (History of the Christian Church, by P Schaff, D.D., ii. 346).

Dear ones, this is who these supposed "Divine Revelations" were later canonized and today we are told the "Holy Spirit" decided for us what books were to be "authoritative" for faith and practice. It seems more likely "might made right!"

Dean Milman, the celebrated historian says:

"It might have been supposed that nowhere would Christianity appear in such commanding majesty as in a council, which should gather from all quarters of the world the most eminent prelates and the most distinguished clergy; that a lofty and serene piety would govern all their proceedings, and profound and dispassionate investigation exhaust every subject; that human passions and interest would stand rebuked before that awful assembly; that the sense of their own dignity as well as the desire of impressing their brethren with the solemnity and earnestness of their belief would at least exclude all intemperance of manner and language... History shows that melancholy reverse. Nowhere is Christianity less attractive, and if we look to the ordinary tone and character of the proceedings, less authoritative, than in the councils of the church. It is in general a fierce collision of two rival factions, neither of which will yield, each of which is solemnly pledged against conviction. Intrigue, injustice, violence, decisions on authority alone, and that the authority of a turbulent majority, decisions by wild acclamation rather than by sober inquiry, detract from the reverence, and impugn the judgments, at least of the later councils....rejoicing at the damnation imprecated against the humiliated adversary....the degeneracy is rapid from the council of Nicea to that of Ephesus, where each party came determined to use every means of haste, maneuver, court influence, bribery, to crush his adversary; where there was an encouragement of, if not an appeal to the violence of the populace, to anticipate the decrees of the council; where each had his own tumultuous foreign rabble to back his quarrel; and neither would scruple at any means to obtain the ratification of their anathemas through persecution by the evil government. (H.H. Milman, D.D., History of Latin Christianity, New York, 1871, p 226).

Gregory of Nazianzus, the Christian father, speaks of them as "assemblies of cranes and geese" (Schaff, History of the Christian Church, ii. 347). Utterly disgusted, he decline to have anything to do with them, saying:

"To tell the truth, I am inclined to shun every collection of bishops, because I have never yet seen that a synod came to a good end, or abated evils instead of increasing them. For in those assemblies (and I do not think I

express myself too strongly here) indescribable contentiousness and ambition prevail....Therefore I have withdrawn myself, and have found rest to my soul only in solitude" (Ep. Ad. Procop., 55 old order, Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, ii. 347).

The third general council of the church, which was held at Ephesus in 431 A.D., was marked by "shameful intrigue, uncharitable lust of condemnation, and coarse violence of conduct" (Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, ii. 348). Both factions came with armed escorts, as if going to battle (Ibid., ii. 723-725), and were followed by great mobs of the ignorant rabble, slaves and seamen, the lower populace of Constantinople, peasants, and bathmen, and hordes of women, prepared for violence; the city was patrolled by troops (Ibid., i. 242), and Nestorius and John of Antioch had armed body guards to protect them from the violence of Cyril's party (Ibid., p. 242). The two bands fought in the streets and much blood was shed (Ibid., p. 242). At the reading of the imperial decree such a tumult arose that all the contending bishops were ordered under arrest (Ibid., i. 242).

An effort was made immediately after to hold a council in Constantinople, and such was the fear of a riot that it had to be adjourned to the suburban district across the Bosphorus (Ibid., i. 242).

In August 449 A.D., there met in Ephesus a synod which occupies a notorious place in the scandals of church history, and which, from the fraud and violence by which everything was carried, and the odious character of its proceedings, has received the name of the "Robbers Council." Dioscorus presided with brutal violence (Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, ii. 738), protected by soldiers. The fear of personal injury was so great that Flavian and his friends, composing one faction, hardly dared to open their lips, while Theodoret was excluded entirely. A communication, presented from Eusebius, was received by the crown with cries of "Let Eusebius be burnt; let him be burned alive. As he has cut Christ in two, so let him be cut in two" (Ibid., p. 738). Three delegates from Rome were so terrified, that they did not venture to read an epistle which they bore from Leo (Ibid., p. 738 ff.). The subject of the canon was, of course, not the only one discussed by councils. In fact, in many councils it was not referred to. Dioscorus and his party wished Flavian and his friends to sign a confession of that that Christ had but one nature. Flavian refused to do so. At a given signal the doors were thrown open, a band of soldiers and an armed mob rushed in, and the terrified bishops of the Flavian party were compelled, by blows and at the point of the sword, to sign (Mosheim, Eccl. Hist., Bk. 2, Cent. 5, pt. 2, ch. v). Where before there had been two parties there was now not alone a majority, but almost unanimity (Milman, Hist. Latin. Christ., i. 288). The decree having been signed, Dioscorus was no longer able to control his anger, and he struck the vanquished Flavian (Ibid., i. 289). Thus encouraged, a crown of infuriated monks set upon the unfortunate bishop of Jerusalem, crying "Kill him! Kill him!" and they beat and kicked him, and inflicted such injuries that death ensued shortly after (Ibid., i. 289, Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, ii. 739). Dean Milman remarks, significantly, that this was not the last council defiled by blood (Milman, Hist. Latin. Christ., i. 289).

Another council, called to meet in Nicea in 451 A.D., was so unruly that it had to be summoned to Chalcedon, across the straits from Constantinople, where the emperor could reach it with his troops and compel order (Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, ii. 742). It is known as the Council of Chalcedon. The proceeding were continually interrupted by yells and tumult (Ibid., ii. 743), and even the laymen were compelled to remind the bishops of their clerical dignity (Ibid., ii. 743). "At Chalcedon," says Dr. Philip Schaff, "the introduction of the renowned expositor and historian Theodoret provoked a scene which almost involuntarily reminds us of the modern brawls of Greek and Roman monks at the holy sepulchre under the restraining influence of the Turkish police. Theodoret's Egyptian opponents shouted with all their might: 'Away with him, this teacher of Nestorius.' His friends replied with equal violence: 'They forced us (at the Robber Council) by blows to subscribe, away the Manichaeans, the enemies of Flavian, the enemies of the faith. Away with the murderer Dioscorus. Who does not know his wicked deeds?' The Egyptian bishops cried again: 'Away with the Jew, the adversary of God, and call him not bishop.' To which the original bishops answered: 'Away with the rioters, away with the murderers! The orthodox man belongs to the council.'" The military had to interfere to quell the proceedings (Schaff, Hist. Christ. Church, ii. 348).

At the council held at Constantinople in 785 A.D., the soldiery burst into the chamber and dispersed the affrighted bishops because they did not approve of the bishop's enactments (Milman, ii. p. 345); and the second council of Nicea (787 A.D.) denounced this council of Constantinople as a synod of fools and madmen (Ibid., ii.

346).

There is one curious fact to which I can not refrain from calling attention. No Christian historian, whether Mosheim, Milman, Schaff, or any other, has ever perceived, apparently, the grotesque absurdity of an assembly attempting to decide by vote a fact in the past. Men vote on questions which have yet to be decided, and thus make them facts; as whether this man or that man shall be president, or this law or that shall be in force; but not on those which are already decided. The reader needs to understand that this is just a small representation of the character of the Church councils. If one is honest with oneself then it is almost impossible to read these proceedings and pretend that the Holy Spirit had anything to do the the results of such violent proceedings let alone believe the decisions made as to what was "inspired" have any credibility whatsoever!

JEROME

Jerome (420 A.D.) included in his New Testament Hebrews and Revelation on the authority of the ancient writers, and not of the existing custom (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 190 ff., showing that in his time these books were frequently rejected. That seems almost ridiculous in light of what you have learned by reading the above accounts. In another work he gave the Epistle of Barnabas at the end of a canonical list, and he expresses the doubts in existence to Philemon, Second Peter, Jude, Second John, and Third John (Davidson, p. 190 ff.), of which, today, no doubts are entertained. The First Epistle of Clement, which is not now in the Bible, was, he says, read in some churches ().

Jerome and St. Augustine were the men most influential in determining the canon of the New Testament (Davidson, Canon, p. 233). The Catholic Church has followed the latter, and Luther and the reformers followed the former. As to their qualifications for deciding the canon Prof. Davidson has said:

"Both were unfitted for critical examination of such a topic. Augustine was a gifted spiritual man, lacking learning and independence. Tradition dominated all his idea about the difficult or disputed books.....His judgment was weak, his sagacity moderate, and the absence of many-sidedness hindered a critical result. Jerome, again, was learned but timid, lacking the courage to face the question fairly or fundamentally and the independence necessary to its right investigation. Belonging as he did to both churches, he recommended the practice of one or the other. He, too, was chiefly influenced by tradition" (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 200).

APOSTOLIC CONSTITUTIONS

The Apostolic Constitutions are a collection of rules, mainly for the guidance of the clergy. They date from the fifth century, and are not to be attributed to the Apostles, their names being another of the many similar endeavors to give authority to books by foreign great names to them. The canons in the Apostolic Constitutions (Apostolic Constitutions, II, 57) omit from the New Testament James, First Peter, Second Peter, First John, Second John, Third John, Jude and Revelation (Ibid., VIII, xlvii. 85). This is the more remarkable from the fact that the canon prescribes with great particularity and minuteness how services in church should be conducted, and what books be read! It also omits Revelation, and included the First Epistle of Clement, the Second Epistle of Clement (an acknowledged forgery), and the Clementine Constitutions (Ibid.). No one ever hears of these books being included in the New Testament now. It is a noteworthy fact that this and the preceding list, contradictory as they are, are both in the same book no less!

It would seem to me than "any thinking believer" would have a hard time accepting the decisions of such men as shown about anything, but let us continue for we have yet much to share before we can draw any concrete conclusion.



20%^{off} on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



THE TESTIMONY OF THE SIXTH CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

This will be a very quite century regarding the Canon of the New Testament.

COSMOS INDICOPLEUSTES (535 A.D.)

Cosmos Indicopleustes never mentions James, First Peter, Second Peter, First John, Second John, Third John, Jude, or Revelation (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 200).

JUNILIUS, AN AFRICAN BISHOP (550 A.D.)

Junilius divided the books of the Bible into three classifications: "Perfect, intermediate, and no authority." Ironically those he considered "perfect" contained the Wisdom of Jesus, which is not now in our Bibles. Those he considered "intermediates" contained the collection of James, Second Peter, Jude, Second John, and Third John, all of which we consider as authoritative as any. Within the classification of "no authority" he included the book of Revelation because it was doubted by man in the East (De. partibus divine legis, i. 2).

Let us continue.



THE TESTIMONY OF THE 7TH THRU THE 10TH CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

THE SIXTH COUNCIL OF CONSTANTINOPLE (629 A.D.)

By the year 629 A.D. so diverse and jumbled had become the views as to what was "God breathed" and "inspired" and "what should be in the New Testament and the Bible," and so great was the need of harmony and unity in these fractions sects which all had different documents to vouch for their authority or the authority of each "sect" against the other, that the sixth general council of Constantinople, otherwise know as the Quinisextine or Trullan council, with a desire apparently to please all parties, ratified the catalogues of Laodicea and Carthage, the Apostolic canons, and those of Athanasius, Gregory of Nazianzus, Amphilochius of Iconium, Cyril of Alexander, and every other one of which they had any knowledge, seemingly indifferent to the absurdity of indorsing the contradictions between them.

Answer for yourself: Cannot God decide what is or what is not to be included, and would he agree to multiple contradictions and call it "Divine"?

You need to understand that no two of these various "canons" were alike. It must be added that the Clementine Constitutions, though in the Apostolic catalogues, and recognized by the assembly as authoritative, were declared to be no longer canonical, on account of the interpolations which they had received (Westcott, Canon, p. 434).

One would think that after such a majestic gathering of the Church that all would be settled. No way! Men continued to disagree even after such a noble endeavor as the Sixth Council of Constantinople which "ratified and canonized everything even if it did conflict with itself."

Answer for yourself: Is this God's Word?

THE FOURTH COUNCIL OF TOLEDO (632 A.D.)

At the fourth council of Toledo Augustine's list was again ratified (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 237).

JOHANNES DAMASCENUS (750 A.D.)

Johannes Damascenus gives as the New Testament all the books now in it as well as the Apostolic Constitutions (De. Fide Orthodoxa, iv. 17).

NICEPHORUS (810 A.D.)

Nicephorus excluded from the New Testament Revelation, and placed it on a level with the Revelation of Peter, the Epistle of Barnabas, and the Gospel according to the Hebrews (Westcott, Canon, p. 552).

PHOTIUS, CECUMENIUS AND THEOPHYLACT

They all rejected Revelation (Ibid.).

ALFRIC, ABBOT OF CERNE (989 A.D.)

He said that the Four Gospels should be included along with the Seven Catholic Epistles, fifteen Epistles of Paul including Hebrews and the Epistle to the Laodiceans, the Acts, and Revelation (Westcott, Canon, p. 452). The Epistle to the Laodiceans here mentioned has a curious history. Paul says in his Epistles to the Colossians (chap. 4:16) that he had written a letter to the the Laodiceans, and an Epistle claiming to be that one was in circulation in the second century (Westcott, Canon, p. 552). The one now under discussion, which is a different book from that one, begins as all the genuine Epistles do, "Paul, an apostle not of men, nor by-men, but by Jesus Christ, to the brethren that be at Laodicea." etc. The earliest trace of it is at the beginning of the sixth century. Gregory the Great, at the close of that period, declare it was written by Paul. Haymo, Bishop of Halberstadt, (853 A.D.), did the same. So did John of Salisbury not long after. The opinion of Africa confirmed these, and the Epistle passed into the early translation of the New Testament. It is in the manuscript of the Vulgate Bible at La Cava. It is in the manuscript of the Latin New Testament which is still preserved at Fulda; in very many western manuscripts of the Bible, as in the great Gothic Bible of Toledo (8th century), in the Book of Armagh (807 A.D.), in the so-called Charlemagne's Bible of the British museum (9th century), in the great Bible of the king's library in the British museum, apparently designed for church use, and in many other magnificent Bibles. Fourteen editions of one or more German versions of it are said to have been printed before Luther's time; it is in the first Bohemian Bible (1488), and it is in the Albigensian Bible at Lyons, where it has its usual place after the Epistle to the Collosians (Westcott, Canon, p. 454).

From the sixth to the sixteenth century, a thousand years, this Epistle was in the Bible of a large share of the Christian people; and yet we now never hear of it, much less do we hear it called the "Word of God".

We are not through yet. Let us continue.



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE TESTIMONY OF THE 16TH CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

REFORMATION & THE COUNCIL OF TRENT

For thirteen hundred years the church had been endeavoring to harmonize on a Bible by permitting the bishops and ecclesiastics to settle the matter generally among themselves, and it had resulted only in violent clashing of opinion. An ominous revolt was breaking out in the North. Luther was pushing the claim of the right of private judgment to its utmost. And as the Bible was the key of the situation, the church, which had been growing more and more restrictive and had thus accumulated precedent for its proposed step, took the whole questions of the canon in hand, fixed it once for all, and forbade any individual to have anything further to do with it.

The council of Trent met Dec. 13, 1545, and on Feb. 12, 1546, the question of the canon was brought forward. Luther had declared that the Bible alone was the source of authority. Luther declared that the universally accepted books of the Old and New Testament, without any of the apocryphal or disputed books, should alone constitute the Bible. The church wanted the apocrypha admitted. The questions were discussed in the council by about thirty ecclesiastics in four sessions. For the second time in the history of the book came a compromise. Four factions were contending for the adoption of different views. All were agreed that tradition, hearsay, and rumor was of equal authority with written records. The grotesque misnomer of calling such men "great," or "scholars," is quite apparent. On the subject concerning which there should have been division, there was unity; and on the one on which there should have been unity; there was division. One party desired two classes of books, St. Augustine had divided them, the canonical and the uncanonical; the second party desired three classes, the acknowledged books, the disputed books of the New Testament, and the apocryphal books of the Old Testament, in each case, of course, the uncanonical books to be thrown out; the third party desired the list simply to be named without anything being said as to the authority of the books, as had been done at the third council of Carthage; and the fourth party demanded that all the books, acknowledged, disputed, and apocryphal, should be classed together, and the whole called of divine authority. As is generally the case in a religious council where "spiritual insight" is permitted to rule, stupidity gained the day. The first and second parties combined about March 8th, but notwithstanding this, on the 15th the third party secured a majority, and the following decree was adopted:

" The holy ecumenical and general council of Trent,...following the examples of the orthodox Fathers, receives and venerates all the books of the Old and New Testaments, ...and also traditions pertaining to faith and conduct,...with an equal feeling of devotion and reverence...The synod though proper, therefore, to annex to this decree a catalogue of the sacred books, lest any doubt might arise concerning those that were approved of. They are the following: [Then are given the names of the books exactly as they stand in the Catholic Bible today, and the decree proceeds.] Now, if any one reading these books in all their parts, as they are usually read in the Latin Vulgate edition, does not hold them for sacred and canonical [observe "canonical," not "inspired"] and, knowing the aforesaid traditions, does industriously condemn them, let him be anathema" (Westcott, Canon, p. 472; Schaff's Creeeds of Christendom, ii. p. 79).

This is where the doctrine originated that we must believe the New Testament or be damned. More than one thousand five hundred years after Jesus Christ was crucified, the superstition arose. And the Catholic Church does not yet insist on inspirations, for it hold to the authority of tradition, and gossip and inspiration do not always agree. But who were the men that established this damnation theory of the Bible?

"This fatal decree, in which the council, harassed by the fear of lay critics and 'grammarians,' gave a new aspect to the whole question of the canon, was ratified by 53 prelates, among whom were not ...one scholar distinguished for historical learning, not one who was fitted by special study, for the examination of a subject in which the truth could alone be determined by the voice of antiquity" (Westcott, Canon, p. 474).

That was the character of the men who said that their work was the work of God. For, let us remember, the books in the Catholic Bible are not what God said should be there but what these men said should be. God had nothing to do with it! Furthermore, this was the first time in the history of the church that anything which had been before simply a matter of custom and opinion, was made a belief to be accepted on pain of eternal damnation (Ibid.), and it has been the unfortunate parent of a most numerous and hideous progeny. Having once a precedent for declaring endless punishment a penalty for non-belief in dogmas not taught in the Bible, a whole brood of superstitions followed and have been current to this day.

This practically settled the question of the canon in the Catholic Church (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 237). A few men, later, protested, and endeavored to revise the list (Westcott, Canon, p. 475), but the struggle was useless.

What I find amazing is that the absurdity of the Eastern Church, which had for one thousand three hundred years declared persistently that the book of Revelation was not written by John and was not entitled to a place in the Bible, wheeled squarely about, and in a council held in Jerusalem in 1672 A.D., adopted the decree of Trent (Davidson, The Canon of the Bible, p. 246). Today the Eastern Church considers Revelation as much the word of God as any other book (Westcott, Canon, p. 487).

THE WORSHIP OF A BOOK...INSTEAD OF GOD

The Protestant Church today is a book-worshipper. It makes a fetich out of a book. The Catholics are little for the Bible, and ever have. The say, "Take away the whole book if you like, and the church will still remain in all its power. The book is the creation of the church, not the church the creation of the book." The Protestants, finding themselves confronted with an infallible church, had to oppose it with an infallible book. And they made a book infallible, which before had not been considered so. And well they might for they were compelled to. It is commonly the case that the overthrow of one superstition is only accomplished by the establishment of another in its place. The Catholics had the prestige of antiquity, and of being considered the only true Church of God, and they threatened with eternal damnation every man who followed Luther. The masses of the people of the North, ignorant and superstitious, were naturally terrified by the awful threat, and the only wonder is that they ever challenged this religious juggernaut. To meet the challenge, Luther, Calvin, and others said that the Bible was "supernaturally inspired." The origin of the books having been forgotten (as most Christians today do not possess such knowledge as well), men, credulous and in trouble, came to think that because the books were written of God they were written by God. The reformers declared that the Bible and not the church was the sole source of authority. This succeeded, and the decrees of the Vatican were answered by such reasoning by the Protestants. The doctrine of the divine and infallible inspiration of the New Testament spread as did the military advances through Europe.

That this is so, and that the idea arose with men who were deluded, is illustrated by the following ridiculous decree, adopted by the Calvinistic council of Switzerland in 1675 A. D.:

"Almighty God not only provided that His word, which is the power of every one who believes, should be committed to writing through Moses, the Prophets, and Apostles, but also has watched over it with a fatherly care up to the present time, and guarded it lest it might be corrupted by the craft of Satan or any fraud of

men...The Hebrew volume of the Old Testament, which we have received from tradition of the Jewish church, to which formerly the oracles of God were committed, and retain at the present day, both in its contents and in its vowels, the points themselves, or at least the force of the points, and both in its substance and its words is divinely inspired, so that, together with the volume of the New Testament, is the single and uncorrupted rule of our faith and life, by whose standard, as by a touchstone, all versions which exist, whether Eastern or Western, must be tried, and whenever they vary, be made conformable to it" (Neimeyer, Collection Confessionum, p. 730). **Nothing could be further from the truth!**

THE PROBLEM WITH SUCH A BELIEF IN DIVINE INSPIRATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT

Three things indicate the grim ferocity of this dogma:

1. It says the God has guarded the Bible from corruption; yet Griesbach collected one hundred and fifty thousand various readings in the New Testament manuscripts alone (B. A. Hinsdale, M.A., Genuineness and Authenticity of the Gospels, Cincinnati, 1872, p. 130), the greater part of which must, of course, be corruptions, since there can be but one correct reading for any passage.
2. It says the vowels were inspired, whereas the ancient Hebrew literature had no vowels.
3. It says that the vowel-points were inspired; whereas they did not come into use until the seventh century after Jesus, and were not perfected until four centuries later. This last article is a relic of that ancient belief that the translators, the copyists, and all the men who had aught to do with the transmission of the Bible from century to century, were inspired.

THE BELGIAN CONFESSION (1561-1563 A.D.)

The Belgian Confession is just another curious illustration of the highly wrought mental condition of that time. It says: "We embrace the Holy Scripture in those two volumes of the Old and New Testament, which are called the canonical books, about which there is no controversy" (Neimeyer, Collection Confessionum, pp. 361-363, Art. 3-7).

What do they mean by saying "about which there is no controversy?"

Then follows a list of the books of the Bible as we receive them now, **including also the books which, as you have seen, had been in controversy for 1500 years and were even then.** And notwithstanding these facts the italicized words were subsequently changed to read "about which there never was any controversy" (Ibid.). **What a lie!**

The creed proceeds, "And we believe these things contained in them...because the Holy Spirit witnesses to our consciences that they emanated from God" (Ibid., pp. 361-363). We are told by theologians that we cannot trust our reason, that we must "experience the testimony of the spirit" to believe the doctrines of the church, and that this testimony can be relied upon. **Yet here we find a people offering the "testimony of the spirit" to the truth of a thing which we now know to be false!!!** The "testimony of the spirit" is a mental delusion. The Christian no doubt thinks he has it. He is honest in it, but he mistakes. There is no such thing. His imagination supplies the facts, just as it the case with a man suffering from delirium tremens, who thinks he sees various hideous creatures. Righteous enthusiasm, such as says that "every word in the blessed New Testament was inspired by God", is a mental and moral delirium tremens.

The Protestants, however, through convinced that the Bible was infallibly inspired, had their difficulties in determining what the Bible really was. And the fierceness with which they insisted on their views ended in the suppression of all historical criticism (Westcott, Canon, p. 465). Erasmus (1467-1536 A.D.) said that Hebrews was not written by Paul, nor Second John and Third John by the Apostle, but by another John; nor Revelation by John (Westcott, Canon, p. 467). He was the literary leader of the Reformation. While he was still a Catholic,

an attack was made upon his views by the Sarbonne, the theological faculty of Paris; censure was placed on his doubts, and it was declared that, no matter if the genuineness of certain books had been disputed in ancient times, the fact that the church has since accepted them made it wrong for any Christian to dispute them (Westcott, Canon, p. 470).

BODENSTEIN, OF KARLSTADT (1520 A.D.)

Bodenstein, the reformer, and great friend but finally the persecuted enemy of Luther, divided the books of the Bible into three classes. In the first he placed the Four Gospels; in the second of "less authority" he placed the "acknowledged" Epistles of the New Testament (i.e., thirteen of Paul, First Peter, and First John); and in the third class, as of least authority, Hebrews, James, Second Peter, Second John, Third John, Jude, and Revelation. He omitted the book of Acts entirely.

LUTHER

Luther said that Hebrews was written by neither Paul nor an apostle but did not place it on equality with the epistles written by the apostles. He thought it was a compilation for pre-existing records, and while it had much in it that was good, it also had "wood, straw, or hay" in its composition. James was, he said, an epistle of straw, with no character of the Gospel in it; it was not written by any apostle, and was not a true Bible book (Pref. Epis. Jacobi). The Epistle of Jude was, he declared, a reprint from Second Peter (compare the second chapter of Second Peter and the first part of the third chapter of the Epistle of Jude, he will see that they closely resemble each other) and therefore it did not, in his opinion, belong among the canonical books (Pred. Epis. Judae). Revelation he considered neither prophetic nor apostolic, and though that it was almost on a level with the fourth book of Esdras, which last he proposed to throw into the river Elbe (Davidson, p. 216). He modified this view twelve years later so far as to say that it was a dumb prophecy, and that there was no objection to any one believing it to have been written by the Apostle John, who desired to do so (Westcott, p. 479). As for himself he did not believe it. He placed Hebrews, James, Jude and Revelation in an appendix to his New Testament, as of inferior authority (Westcott, Canon, p. 477).

ZWINGLI (1531 A.D.)

Zwingli declared that he took no account of Revelation, for it was not a book of the Bible (Works, ed. Schuler II, i. 169). Ecolampadius (1531 A.D.) said that the Protestants of Switzerland did not compare James, Jude, Second Peter, Second John, Third John, and Revelation, with the other books of the Bible (Epis., i. 3, c., ed. 1548). Calvin, on the other hand, said that though Hebrews was not written by Paul, it was through a Satanic device that its authority had been questioned (Pref. Heb.), and that Second Peter, though not written by Peter, was written by some disciple at his command (Pref. Epis. as Heb.). He passed over Second John, Third John, and Revelation, without any notice in his commentary.

Luther and his successors, it will be seen, made the same distinction between the New Testament books that had been made between those of the Old Testament, classifying them according to the "generally received" and the "controverted." It was the council of Trent which obliterated the distinction between the books of the Old Testament, and the Calvinists who obliterated it between the books of the New (Davidson, Canon, p. 217). The Lutherans also discarded subsequently Luther's views, and accepted all the books as of equal authority, and thus all over the Protestant world the books of the canon were placed on the same level.

We are almost done. Let us continue.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE TESTIMONY OF THE 17TH CENTURY CHURCH FATHERS CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

WESTMINSTER ASSEMBLY (1647 A.D.)

Finally, the Westminster assembly in 1647 adopted a list which has since been accepted by the Presbyterians of England, Ireland, and America, the Congregationalists of both countries, and, in short, by the Protestant evangelical and orthodox churches with which we come in contact in our daily life in the United States. It is in the famous Westminster Confession that we find the authority for the current books in our Christian Protestant Bibles, and is the same as the Catholic list except that it rejects the Old Testament apocrypha (Schaff, Creeds of Christendom, iii. 601). The latter was, however, for a long time printed in an appendix, and some who read this, especially elderly persons, can remember seeing the apocrypha in the old family Bibles. But in 1827 the British and Foreign Bible Society decided that it would no longer circulate those books (Lange, Comm., xv. 56ff., Am. ed., 1880), the American Bible Society followed its example (Schaff, Bible Dict., "Apocrypha"), and thus it was that our Bible received its finishing touch, as we have been accustomed to see it.

Now let us finish.



THE INESCAPABLE CONCLUSION CONCERNING THE NEW TESTAMENT

I have attempted to give you, the reader, a brief review of the subject at hand:

- We found without question that the greater number of books of the New Testament are anonymous.
- Of these books no one knows who wrote them, and no one knows when they were written. They are, in the case of the most important books, of those most relied on for doctrinal support, compilations from pre-existing records. But who wrote those records, and who made the compilations, are entirely unknown.
- We have seen repeatedly that when the books of the New Testament came into use they were not considered inspired or the word of God as we esteem them today.
- Many Gospels, Epistles, and Revelations, not now in use in Christianity, were read in the churches in the early centuries for edification.
- About the close of the second century or the beginning of the third century, when the Gentile Roman Catholic Church was forming, a source of authority for appeal in case of dispute over new doctrines was necessary, and the Fathers instituted the theory that certain books were "inspired" in hopes of bolstering their political, economic, and theological positions as one "sect" fought another "sect" for supremacy. But the books which they said were divine were not always the same books which we have now. They declared many books to be inspired which we do not think to be; and they ignored and rejected books which have since been invested with divine honors.
- The contentions of the sects made it impossible for the new church to unite on the Gospels, which had been first in use, and they were, therefore, discarded, and our present Four Gospels were substituted. To give them greater authority, the names of the Apostles who had been with Jesus were forged to them, literary forgery in those days not being considered a crime as today. **The Fathers in asserting that the books were inspired, were guided not by critical ability nor by the Holy Spirit, but by ignorance and gross superstition.** Instead of being great scholars, they were extremely superstitious, ignorant, and credulous, and in general very inferior intellectually.
- After much controversy, and even bloodshed, it became apparent that they could not agree as to what books should form the New Testament; and councils took the matter in hand, and for nearly twelve centuries they argued and discussed it. And finally, the Gentile Roman Catholic Church in the council of Trent, and the Greek Church in the council of Constantinople, decided once for all what the list should be for their adherents; and the Westminster Assembly gave the English-speaking Protestants their catalogue of current books as well.

There you have it. It is not pretty, but that is because the Holy Spirit was not behind it and had nothing to do with such confusion. The New Testament, as we have it today, is hardly more than three centuries old.

SO WHAT ARE YOU GOING TO DO NOW KNOWING THIS?

Well you can choose to do nothing, or you can do what I did when I ran across such information years ago; I began a serious study of the New Testament and the origins of the religious doctrines within it. Since most of our readership looks to Jesus as the greatest example of Godliness, then why don't we let "this mind be in you

that was in Christ Jesus." I recommend that, but sadly, that mind is not always accurately portrayed in the New Testament. Now only do we have a problem of what books, or who wrote them, but the doctrines contained within them are often diametrically opposed to what Jesus and the earliest Jerusalem church believed let alone expected non-Jews to believe as part of "believing Israel."

This paragraph as I write it is one of the most important statements I have ever made. On the surface it seems so simple but I assure you that the dynamics involved in its contemplation are explosive. I ask that you give serious attention and thought to what I will say and share with you in these articles that follow in this web-site as we look at the problems and contradictions of religious doctrines in the New Testament when compared with the Jewish Scriptures read and believed by Jesus. What you read in the next days and weeks as delineated on this web-site, as well as <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com> has the ability to change your life and deliver you from the most darkest and vilest idolatry of which most of you are not yet aware. In these articles I will disclose the substantial identity of Gentile Christianity as known and practiced today with the most popular and widespread "Pagan" religion of all time, Sun worship. Such religious doctrines, of which now you are not aware, are scattered throughout the New Testament and put into the mouth of Jesus and the Apostles, even Paul. You may be more familiar with such Sun worship by the term of Mithraism, or the Persian Zoroastrian religion. You might not be aware, and I find that the vast majority of Christians are not, but Mithraism was the closest and all but successful rival of Christianity in the Roman world, and which might indeed have been successful, but that, soon after Constantine prostituted the Empire to the Church,— "with the triumph of Christianity Mithraism came to a sudden end. The laws of Theodosius signed its death warrant." (Catholic Encyclopedia, x, 402.) That there may be no suspicion that the recital of these remarkable identities of Christian "revelation" on the pages of the New Testament line up identically with Pagan religious doctrines in many ways. If you look to Jesus for "Divine Revelation" or even to Christianity as a "Divine Revelation" then once you see this information then it is beyond any question that God had anything to do with giving the Christian much of what he believed today; let alone believes about Jesus.

You should ask yourself, especially in light now after having seen how this document touted as the Word of God, the New Testament, was gathered and put together, one simple question: WHAT IS REVELATION... AND IS CHRISTIANITY BUILT UPON DIVINE, UNIQUE, AND G-DLY REVELATION? "

"When Pagan myths already current and long known to everyone for hundreds and thousands of years can be later found to be foundational to many dogmas and doctrines held sacred in Christianity because they are held and believed to be unique revelations from God and as found on page after page of the New Testament, then Divine revelation and inspiration cannot be appealed to for the origin of the Christian Faith and its teaching and such incriminating evidence must bring serious doubt to such doctrines and dogmas within Christianity as stemming from God... sadly these once held "sacred" doctrines must now understood as pagan copies."

You have seen the history of the documents (New Testament) espousing such "Divine Revelation;" now it is time for you to begin such a study into these doctrines of the New Testament as compared with the beliefs of the Jewish Bible Jesus used.....to see the changes, the misquotations on purpose, the purposeful changing of the Jewish Scriptures in order to replace the religion of Jesus intended for all the world with one of Rome's making.

The Catholic Encyclopedia states: "The existence of revelation (as in the New Testament) is as reasonably established as any historical fact"! (C.E. xiii, 607.). I would think that the evidence I just submitted to you says otherwise without a doubt. It is time to wake up! These above statements are the most incredible lies ever uttered in the history of mankind. And I will quickly prove them so. Lets get back to truth, shall we. "Divine Revelation is thus of things not previously known and which the revelationless mind of man is incapable of acquiring or inventing by its own efforts." So exactly with "revelation": if some impostor or deluded person (e.g. Mohammed or Joseph Smith) claims that he has received a personal—and therefore necessarily private—"revelation" from some g-d, the only way whereby he can get a valid patent of authenticity and credibility for

his "revelation," is to prove that its subject-matter has never before been known and in credulous circulation; the moment that from the search of the records—of other, or comparative religions,—it is shown that the same proposition has been previously known and current, in use and practice among some other priestcraft and its devotees—the thing is no revelation at all: the claim is a fraud!!!

PUTTING GENTILE CHRISTIANITY AND ITS DOCTRINES UNDER THE MICROSCOPE OF COMPARATIVE RELIGION

Let us see how this indisputable rule works when applied to Gentile Christianity. In doing so we will either prove beyond any doubt that the Christian Faith is Divine unique revelation to mankind and worthy of trust and faith for the world to come or else is but the reiteration of prior pagan beliefs and is not to be trusted for truth or preparation for the world to come. The answer to such inquiry will either prove Christianity uniquely Divine and God breathed as is attested for it; or expose it as anything but Divine but rather pagan whereby then you would be better served to return to the faith once given the Saints; Biblical Judaism where the Gentile believer, as a Godfearer, has a place both within Biblical Judaism and the Israel of God and not apart from it. Let us see what we can find, shall we?

You quest begins as you continue to read through this web-site as you examine the various studies presented:

- The New Testament And Related Studies
- The Jewish Jesus
- Pauline Studies
- Messianic Studies
- Johannie Studies

Let me say in closing we stand ready to help each and every one of you come to the knowledge of the truth and "THE" faith once given to the saints. Extensive bibliographies are presented and it is hoped you will avail yourselves to them. Feel free to E-mail us or give us a call if you wish.....Bet Emet, Pastor Craig, 972-6756193 as we look forward to helping you to see through the maze of 2000 years of Gentile corruption of Jesus and the faith once given to all. Shalom.



bennoah1@airmail.net



20%^{off} on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



HERESIES OF THE ROMAN CATHOLIC CHURCH...THE SAME ONES WHO GAVE YOU THE INFALLIBLE & INERRANT NEW TESTAMENT NO LESS

Constantly we at Bet Emet are not understood when being critical of much of what the New Testament teaches. We understand such misunderstanding because most of our readers have not had the opportunity to read and study to the level we have over the last 15 years where we discovered much that forced we make changes in our religious belief system. Simply we found, based upon our studies, that much of the New Testament, especially in doctrinal positions, was a replacement of the actual beliefs of a Rabbi named Yeshua who lived in the first century. A cursory reading of the New Testament does not always provide such an understanding, for most read it as if it is "inspired, infallible, and inerrant." Upon just a little personal study into this area and when using good sources one quickly can see that they have deceived in this crucial area of their life.

Understand such a false trust and belief in the New Testament by most Christians today is not based upon the reader's individual study, but rather upon the hearsay he has picked up by listening to others express such trust in the New Testament. The sad fact of the matter is that those who say such things have never done their homework to the depth necessary to see the problems inherent in accepting the New Testament as authoritative.

The New Testament was never meant to be a replacement book for the Jewish Scriptures, but sadly has become that today for the vast majority of non-Jewish believers in God.

Doctrine, when found in the New Testament, to be true must conform to the Word of God.....THE OLD TESTAMENT: "To the law and to the testimony; if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." (Isaiah 8:20)

Answer for yourself: Do you believe the above statement by Isaiah the prophet? If you do not, then you need to read no further for this study will not have benefit you for you since you have in reality no substance for your authority. One then believes what he wants and not what was intrusted to Holy men of old preserved and handed down to others who paved the way for the Messiah to come.

Thus if we find doctrines in the New Testament which contradict the Jewish Scriptures...such doctrines are to be understood as fables and lies. To fail to do so contradicts Isaiah the Prophet as well as Moses.

Before you read the following...understand that those who gave you the following man-made doctrines are the same ones who gave you the NEW TESTAMENT that has ended up replacing the Bible Jesus used...the Old Testament as taken from the Jewish Tankah (the true Masoretic Text).

Can we trust the Holy Spirit to have led these early anti-Semitic Catholics into all truth, and should we trust their collection of writings called the New Testament when they, in many places, contradict Moses and Jesus?

We at Bet Emet cannot, and we offer no man apologies.

Just understand that when you read the NT, with all its additions, purposeful misquotes of the Jewish Scriptures, changes, deletions and doctrinal creationism over the early centuries of the Gentile Church, these were the doctrines behind the men who did it!!!!!!!!!!!!!!

HERESY

DATE

OF ALL THE HUMAN TRADITIONS taught and practiced by the Roman Catholic Church, which are contrary to the Bible, the most ancient are the **prayers for the dead and the sign of the Cross**. Both began 300 years after Christ. 310

Wax Candles introduced in church. about 320

Veneration of angels and dead saints. 375

The Mass, as a daily celebration, adopted. 394

The worship of Mary, the mother of Jesus, and the use of the term, "Mother of God", as applied to her, originated in the Council of Ephesus 431

Priests began to dress differently from the laity 500

The doctrine of Purgatory was first established by Gregory the Great 593

The Latin language, as the language of prayer and worship in churches, was also imposed by Pope Gregory I 600 years after Christ. 600

The Bible teaches that we pray to God alone. In the primitive church never were prayers directed to Mary, or to dead saints. This practice began in the Roman Church (only 2 hundred years after 600

canonizing the New Testament)

The Papacy is of pagan origin. The title of pope or universal bishop, was first given to the bishop of Rome by the wicked emperor Phocas. This he did to spite Bishop Ciriacus of Constantinople, who had justly excommunicated him for his having caused the assassination of his predecessor emperor Mauritius. Gregory 1, then bishop of Rome, refused the title, but his successor, Boniface III, first assumed title "pope." 610

Jesus did not appoint Peter to the headship of the apostles and forbade any such notion. Note:-- Nor is there any mention in Scripture, nor in history, that Peter ever was in Rome, much less that he was pope there for 25 years; Clement, 3rd bishop of Rome, remarks that there is no real 1st century evidence that Peter ever was in Rome."

The kissing of the Pope's feet. It had been a pagan custom to kiss the feet of emperors. The Word of God forbids such practices. 709

The Temporal power of the Popes. When Pepin, the usurper of the throne of France, descended into Italy, called by Pope Stephen II, to war against the Italian Lombards, he defeated them and gave the city of Rome and surrounding territory to the pope. Jesus expressly forbade such a thing, and He himself refused worldly kingship. 750

Worship of the cross, images and relics was authorized. This was by order of Dowager Empress Irene of Constantinople, who first caused to pluck the eyes of her own son, Constantine VI, and then called a church council at the request of Hadrian I, pope of Rome at that time. 788

Such practice is called simply IDOLATRY in the Bible, and is severely condemned. (Read Ex. 20:4; 3:17; Deut. 27:15; Psalm 115).

Holy Water, mixed with a pinch of salt and blessed by the priest, was authorized 850

The **veneration of St. Joseph** began 890

The **baptism of bells** was instituted by Pope John XIV 965

Canonization of dead saints, first by Pope John XV. 995

Every believer and follower of Christ is called saint in the Bible.

Fasting on Fridays and during Lent were imposed. 998

Imposed by popes said to be interested in the commerce of fish. (Bull, or permit to eat meat), some authorities say, began in the year 700. This is against the plain teaching of the Bible.

The **Mass** was developed gradually as a sacrifice; attendance made obligatory in the 11th century.

- The **celibacy** of the priesthood was decreed by Pope Hildebrand, Boniface VII. Jesus imposed no such rule, nor did any of the apostles. On the contrary, St. Peter was a married man, and St. Paul says that bishops were to have wife and children. 1079
- The **Rosary**, or prayer beads was introduced by Peter the Hermit, in the year 1090. Copied from Hindus and Mohammedans. The counting of prayers is a pagan practice and is expressly condemned by Christ. (Matt. 6:5-13). 1090
- The **Inquisition** of heretics was instituted by the Council of Verona in the year 1184. Jesus never taught the use of force to spread his religion. 1184
- The sale of **Indulgences**, commonly regarded as a purchase of forgiveness and a permit to indulge in sin. Christianity, as taught in the Bible, condemns such a traffic and it was the protest against this traffic that brought on the Protestant Reformation in the 16th century. 1190
- The dogma of **Transubstantiation** was decreed by Pope Innocent III, in the year 1215. By this doctrine the priest pretends to perform a daily miracle by changing a wafer into the body of Christ, and then he pretends to eat Him alive in the presence of his people during Mass. The Bible condemns such absurdities. 1215
- Confession of sin to the priest** at least once a year was instituted by Pope Innocent III., in the Lateran Council. The Bible commands us to confess our sins direct to God. (Read Psa. 51:1-10; Luke 7:48; 15:21; I John 1:8-9). 1215
- The **adoration of the wafer** (Host), was decreed by Pope Honorius. So the Roman Church worships a God made by human hands. This is plain idolatry and absolutely contrary to the spirit of the Gospel. (Read John 4:24). 1220
- The **Bible forbidden to laymen** and placed in the Index of forbidden books by the Council of Valencia. Jesus commanded that the Scriptures should be read by all. (1229
- The **Scapular** was invented by Simon Stock, an English monk. It is a piece of brown cloth, with the picture of the Virgin and supposed to contain supernatural virtue to protect from all dangers those who wear it on naked skin. This is fetishism. 1287
- The Roman Church **forbade the cup to the laity**, by instituting the communion of one kind in the Council of Constance. The Bible commands us to celebrate the Passover. 1414
- The **doctrine of Purgatory** was proclaimed as a dogma of faith by Council of Florence. There is not one word in the Bible that would teach the purgatory of priests. 1439

The doctrine of 7 Sacraments affirmed. 1439

The Ave Maria. It was completed 50 years afterward and finally approved by Pope Sixtus V, at the end of 1508 the 16th century.

The Council of Trent, held in the year 1545, declared that Tradition is of equal authority with the Bible. 1545

By tradition is meant human teachings. The Pharisees believed the same way, and Jesus bitterly condemned them, for by teaching human tradition, they nullified the commandments of God.

The apocryphal books were added to the Bible also by the Council of Trent. These books were not recognized as canonical by the Jewish Church. 1546

The Creed of Pope Pius IV was imposed as the official creed 1560 years after Christ and the apostles. 1560

True Christians retain the Holy Jewish Scriptures as their creed. Hence their creed is 1500 years older than

the creed of Roman Catholics.

Pope Pius IX declared the Virgin Mary to have had an immaculate conception. The Bible states that all men, with the sole exception of Christ, are sinners. Mary herself had need of a Savior. (Read Rom. 3:23; 5:12; Psa. 51:5; Luke 1:30,46,47). 1834

In the year 1870 after Christ, Pope Pius IX proclaimed the dogma of Papal Infallibility. This is a blasphemy and the sign of the apostasy and of the anti-christ predicted by St. Paul. Pope's title: "VICARIVS FILII DEI." -- V-5, I-1; C-100, I-1; V-S, I-1; L-50, I-1; I-1; D-500, I-1 Total, 666. 1870

Pope Plus X, in the year 1907, condemned together with "Modernism", all the discoveries of modern science which are not approved by the Church 1907

Pius IX had done the same thing in the Syllabus of 1864.

In the year 1930 Pius XI, condemned the Public Schools 1930

In the year 1931 the same pope Pius XI, reaffirmed the doctrine that Mary is "the mother of God" 1931

This doctrine was first invented by the Council of Ephesus in the year 431. This is a heresy contrary by Mary's own words. (Read Luke 1:46-49; John 2: 1-5).

In the year 1950 the last dogma was proclaimed by Pope Pins XII, the Assumption of the Virgin 1950

Mary

UNDERSTANDING THE ABOVE INFORMATION

Answer for yourself: If you have difficulty in accepting these above heresies as truth, then why do you accept their other beliefs hidden within the New Testament that violate the Laws, the Prophets and the Writings?

This knowledge as given in the above chart alone should at least make one suspicious that other such "heresies" might be contained within the New Testament which you might not at present be aware. This should spur you into your own personal study to find out if such things be so. Believe us at Bet Emet, they are there hidden beneath the contexts of many events which are displayed in the New Testament which are simply unhistorical and can be proven to be in violation of facts and evidence of history which will prove them wrong upon study.

Answer for yourself: If you have difficulty in accepting these above heresies as truth, then why would you accept their other beliefs cleverly contained in the New Testament which, without through knowledge of the Old Testament, will not be noticed as fraudulent in simple reading of the New Testament?

The Roman Church says it never changes; yet, it has done nothing else but invent new doctrines which are contrary to the Bible and the original belief system of Yeshua, and has practiced rites and ceremonies taken bodily from paganism. **Some scholar has found that 75% of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church are of pagan origin. We trust that you desire to be a follower of Jesus/Yeshua more than a follower of your Denomination or Church and its inherited traditions!**

Don't look now my Protestant friends because much of what you practice in your church comes from these pagan background...and most of you are not aware!

THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS INCRIMINATE THEMSELVES AND THE GENTILE CHRISTIAN FAITH...AND I BET YOU NEVER KNEW THIS...DID YOU?

In Seminary I remember looking at the Library shelves that supported the multiple volumes of the Ante-Nicean Fathers. I beheld thousand and thousands of pages of their writings. I even amused myself that to read and understand such a large volume of literature would take years. It did!

What I came to admire about such writings is when you read enough of them you find that these "pro-Christian" writers often incriminated themselves with what they wrote. The following examples are for your benefit.

JUSTIN MARTYR

Eusebius, in his Church History, tells us that Justin, in his Dialogue with Trypho, says "there exists not a people, civilized or semi-civilized, who have not offered up prayers in the name of a crucified Savior to the Father and Creator of all things" (Hist. Eccl. lib i. ch. iv).

The honesty of Justin Martyr as portrayed here is the heart of the subject matter of these web pages. I intend to show you that from the beginning of time the pagan nations had their "crucified Sun-gods" and much recorded about Jesus of Nazareth in the New Testament is nothing more than the "re-telling" of the same Sun-Myths; the only difference is that now they are applied to the life of Jesus the Jew. **Do you want the truth before you die?** Then keep reading.

EUSEBIUS

Eusebius says that "the names of Jesus and Christ were both known and honored by the ancients" (Hist. Eccl. lib. i. ch. iv). **How could this be?**

Eusebius, the great champion of Christianity, admits in his book: "that which is called the Christian religion is neither new nor strange, but-if it be lawful to testify the truth-was known to the ancients"

(Hist. Eccl. lib. 2, ch. v.). **How could this be?**

Eusebius, who is our chief guide for the early history of the Church, confesses that he was by no means scrupulous to record the whole truth concerning the early Christians in the various works which he has left behind him (Eusebius, Hist. Eccl., ch. viii. p. 21).

Edward Gibbon, speaking of Eusebius says: "The gravest of the ecclesiastical historians, Eusebius himself, indirectly confesses that he has related what might rebound to the glory, and that he has suppressed all that could tend to the disgrace, of religion. Such an acknowledgment will naturally excite a suspicion that a writer who has so openly violated one of the fundamental laws of history has not paid a very strict regard to the observance of the other; and the suspicion will derive additional credit from the character of Eusebius, which was less tinctured with credulity, and more practiced in the arts of courts, than that of almost any of his contemporaries" (Gibbon, Rome, vol. ii., Philadelphia, 1876).

SAINT AUGUSTINE

Augustine is quoted as saying: "That in our time is the Christian Religion, which to know and follow is the most sure and certain health, called according to that name, but not according to the thing itself, of which is the name; for the thing itself which is now called the Christian Religion really was known to the ancients, nor was wanting at any time from the beginning of the human race until the time when Christ came in the flesh, from whence the true religion, which had previously existed, began to be called "Christian;" and this in our days is the Christian religion, not as having been wanting in former times, but as having in later times received this name" (Opera Augustini, vol. i. p. 12; quoted in Taylor's Diegesis, p. 42).

Now if you read these quotes you have to admit that they are very troubling to the contemporary Christian. I always heard: "Where there is smoke there is fire" [pardon the pun please]. If you find the courage to look beyond these quotes then you will find the kindling used for the paganization of Christianity by the Gentile Church whereby it become little more than another manifestation of Sun Worship. Jesus know the difference and you should as well.

TERTULLIAN

Tertullian, one of the Christian Fathers (A.D. 200), originally a Pagan, and at one time Presbyter of the Christian Church in Africa, reasons in the following manner on the evidences of Christianity: "I find no other means to prove myself to be impudent with success, and happily a fool, than by my contempt of shame, - as, for instance, I maintain that the Son of God was born. Why am I not ashamed of maintaining such a thing? Why, but because it is itself a shameful thing. I maintain that the Son of God died. Well, that is wholly credible, because it is monstrously absurd. I maintain that after having been buried he rose again; and that I take to be mainly true, because it was manifestly impossible" (Taylor, Diegesis, p. 326).

For example, early Church Father Tertullian (@ 160-220 C.E.), an "ex-Pagan" and Bishop of Carthage, ironically admits the true origins of the Christ story and of all other such god-men by stating in refutation of his critics, "You say we worship the sun; so do you" (Wheless, Forgery in Christianity, p. 147).

Interestingly, a previously strident believer and defender of the faith, Tertullian later renounced Christianity. (Wheless, Forgery in Christianity, p. 147).

Cardinal Newman, in his book, The Development of the Christian Religion, admits that ... "Temples, incense, oil lamps, votive offerings, holy water, church holidays and season of devotions, processions, blessing of fields, sacerdotal vestments, the tonsure (of priests and monks and nuns), images ... are all of pagan origin..." (Page 359).

HERESIES are those doctrines and practices which are contrary to the Bible. They are also called "human traditions" or "doctrines of men". Both Peter predicted and warned that in the later times "false teachers" would rise within the Church and bring in "damnable heresies" and "doctrines of devils". (Read II Peter 2:1-3). Jesus rebuked the Pharisees, for they transgressed the commandments of God by keeping their traditions. "in vain," He said, [speaking in the first person representing the Father] "they worship me by keeping for doctrines the commandments of men" (Matt. 15:3,9).

The testimony of their heresies can be found in much of the New Testament today which did not even become recognized until the fourth century.

The Word of God commands us to get out of Idolatry and pagan expressions of religious faith. All true "Christians" SHOULD desire to be faithful to the religion of Jesus as taught in the Jewish Bible.....the Jewish Scriptures...the Jewish Tanakh, and many of them can still be detected within the New Testament with a little study. However, so much more is alien to what the true Yeshua both believed and practiced. Now is the time to study. I hope you take the challenge. Your rewards are eternally waiting....will you merit them?



THE ALEXANDRIAN INFLUENCE UPON EARLY CHRISTIANITY

In Alexandria, in Egypt, there was an immense library, founded by the Ptolemies. This library was situated in the Alexandrian Museum; the apartments which were allotted for it were beautifully sculptured, and crowded with the choicest statues and pictures; the building was built of marble. This library eventually comprised four hundred thousand volumes. In the course of time, probably on account of inadequate accommodation for so many books, an additional library was established, and placed in the temple of Serapis. The number of volumes in this library, which was called the daughter of that in the museum, was eventually three hundred thousand. There were, therefore, **seven hundred thousand volumes in these royal collections.**

In the establishment of the museum, Ptolemy Soter, and his son Philadelphus, had three objects in view:

1. The perpetuation of such knowledge as was then in the world;
2. Its increase;
3. Its diffusion.

1. For the perpetuation of knowledge. Orders were given to the chief librarian to buy, at the king's expense, whatever books he could. A body of transcribers was maintained in the museum, whose duty it was to make correct copies of such works as their owners were not disposed to sell. *Any books brought by foreigners into Egypt* were taken at once to the museum, and when correct copies had been made, the transcript was given to the owner, and the original placed in the library. Often a very large pecuniary indemnity was paid.

2. For the increase of knowledge. One of the chief objects of the museum was that of serving as the home of a body of men who devoted themselves to study, and were lodged and maintained at the king's expense. In the original organization of the museum the residents were divided into four faculties-Literature, Mathematics, Astronomy, and Medicine. An officer of very great distinction presided over the establishment, and had general charge of its interests. Demetrius Phalareus, perhaps the most learned man of his age, who had been Governor of Athens for many years, was the first so appointed. Under him was the librarian, an office sometimes held by men whose names have descended to our times, as Eratosthenes and Apollonius Rhodius. In connection with the museum was a botanical and a zoological garden. These gardens, as their names imply, were for the purpose of facilitating the study of plants and animals. There was also an astronomical observatory, containing armillary spheres, globes, solstitial and equatorial armils, astrolabes, parallactic rules, and other apparatus then in use, the graduation on the divided instruments being into degrees and sixths.

3. For the diffusion of knowledge. In the museum was given, by lectures, conversation, or other appropriate methods, instruction in all the various departments of human knowledge.

There flocked to this great intellectual centre, students from all countries. It is said that at one time not fewer than fourteen thousand were in attendance. Subsequently even the Christian church received from it some of the most eminent of its Fathers, as [Clement of Alexandria](#), Origen, [Athanasius](#), etc.

The library in the museum was burned during the siege of Alexandria by Julius Caesar. To make amends, for this great loss, the library collected by Eumenes, King of Pergamus, was presented by Mark Antony to Queen Cleopatra. Originally it was founded as a rival to that of the Ptolemies. It was added to the collection in the Serapion, or the temple of Serapis.

It was not destined, however, to remain there many centuries, as this very valuable library was willfully destroyed by the Christian Theophilus, and on the spot where this beautiful temple of Serapis stood, in fact, on its very foundation, was erected a church in honor of the "noble army of martyrs," who had never existed.

This we learn from the historian Gibbon, who says that. after this library was destroyed, the appearance of the empty shelves excited the regret and indignation of every spectator, whose mind was not totally darkened by religious prejudice.

The destruction of this library was almost the death-blow to free-thought - wherever Christianity ruled - for more than a thousand years.

The death-blow was soon to be struck, however, which was done by Saint Cyril, who succeeded Theophilus as Bishop of Alexandria.

Hypatia, the daughter of Theon, the mathematician, endeavored to continue the old-time instructions. Each day before her academy stood a long train of chariots; her lecture-room was crowded with the wealth and fashion of Alexandria. They came to listen to her discourses on those questions which man in all ages has asked, but which have never yet been answered What am I ? Where am I? What can I know ?

Hypatia and Cyril; philosophy and bigotry; they cannot exist together. As Hypatia repaired to her academy, she was assaulted by (Saint) Cyril's mob - a mob of many monks. Stripped naked in the street, she was dragged into a church, and there killed *by the club of Peter the Reader*. The corpse was cut to pieces, the flesh was scraped from the bones with shells, and the remnants cast into a fire. *For this frightful crime Cyril was never called to account.*

It seemed to be admitted that the end sanctified the means. So ended Greek philosophy in Alexandria, so came to an untimely close the learning that the Ptolemies had done so much to promote.

The fate of Hypatia was a warning to all who would cultivate profane knowledge. Henceforth there was to be no freedom for human thought. Every one must think as ecclesiastical authority ordered him ; A.D. 414.

In Athens itself philosophy awaited its doom. Justinian at length prohibited its teaching and caused all its schools in that city to be closed.

After this followed the long and dreary *dark ages*, but the sun of *science*, that bright and glorious luminary, was destined to rise again.

THE LINK TO THE MESSIAH OF CHRISTIANITY

The history of this great Alexandrian library is one of the keys which unlock the door, and exposes to our view the manner in which the Hindoo incarnate god *Chrishna*, and the meek and benevolent Buddha, came to be worshiped under the name of *Christ Jesus*. For instance, we have just seen:

- That, "orders were given to the chief librarian to buy at the king's expense *whatever books he could.*"
- That, "one of the chief objects of the museum was that of serving as the home of a *body* of men who devoted themselves to study."
- That, "any books brought by foreigners into Egypt were taken at once to the museum and correct copies

made."

- That, "there flocked to this great intellectual center students from all countries."
- That, "the Christian church received from it some of the most eminent of its Fathers."

And also:

- 6. That, the chief doctrines of the Gnostic Christians "had been held for centuries before their time in many of the cities in Asia Minor. There, it is probable, they first came into existence as Mystae upon the establishment of a direct intercourse with India under the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies."
- 7. That, "the College of Essenes at Ephesus, the Orphics of Thrace, the Curetes of Crete, *are all merely branches of one antique and common religion, and that originally Asiatic.*"
- 8. That, "*their introduction of Buddhism into Egypt and Palestine affords the only true solution of innumerable difficulties in the history of religion.*"
- 9. That, "Buddhism had actually been planted in the dominions of the Seleucidae and Ptolemies (Palestine belonging to the former) before the beginning of the third century B. C., and is proved to demonstration by a passage in the edicts of Asoka."[BEFORE THE THIRD CENTURY B.C.E.!]
- 10. That, "it is very likely that the commentaries (Scriptures) which were among them (the *Essenes*) were the Gospels."
- 11. That, "the principal doctrines and rites of the *Essenes* can be connected with the East, with Parsism, and especially with *Buddhism.*"
- 12. That, "among the doctrines which the *Essenes and Buddhists* had in common was that of the Angel-Messiah."
- 13. That, "they (the *Essenes*) had a flourishing university or corporate body, established at Alexandria, in Egypt, long before the period assigned for the birth of Christ."
- 14. That, "the *very ancient and Eastern doctrine of the Angel-Messiah* had been applied to Gautama Buddha, and so it was applied to Jesus Christ by the *Essenes of Egypt and Palestine*, who introduced this new Messianic doctrine into Essenic Judaism and Essenic Christianity."

THE CORRUPTION OF THE JEWISH BIBLE WHEN TRANSLATED INTO GREEK

What you need to know is that these Essenic-Phytagorean-Buddhists of Alexandria, Egypt, 200 B.C.E. translated the Jewish Bible into Greek. It is called the Septuagint. What you don't know is that many of these ancient religious tenants possessed by these Buddhist Essenes would be written into the Greek translation of the Bible. The existing Jewish Scriptures (the Tanakh) would be mistranslated on purpose in hundreds of places whereby the existing "theologies" of the Greek-Jewish Phythagorean-Buddhists would be intermingled among the existing Jewish texts in order to promote their "beliefs." The theology of this Egyptian sect replaced the writings of Moses and the Prophets in many places and few know it today.

This was the modus operandi used to corrupt the Jewish Scriptures. Of major interest in New Testament study is the alterations of many passages whereby the Essenic Cosmic Angel-Messiah was to replace the Davidic Messiah of the Jewish Scriptures. The Essenes believed in a Cosmic Angel-Messiah g-dman which finds its ultimate origin in sun-myths from the most ancient of days. This Angel-Messiah was made to be the fulfillment of Messianic prophecy originally intended to apply to the Davidic Messiah only!

The doctrine of the "Anointed Angel-Messiah" as taken from the evolution of sun-myths consisted of:

- The Sun-g-dman from heaven (Angel-Messiah incarnation as personified from sun worship).
- This Sun-g-dman was also the Creator
- The doctrine of the atoning sacrificial death of this Sun-g-dman...called the Essene Angel-Messiah... (these concepts coming from Iranian, Pythagorean, Buddhist backgrounds and

influences upon the Essenes)

- The [resurrection of this Angel-Messiah following 3 days](#) (as taken from the sun-myths and the winter solstice).

These doctrines which most think Paul first taught can, with more or less certainty, be connected with the Essenes; even the Essenes in Egypt. **It becomes almost a certainty that Eusebius was right in surmising that Essenic writings have been used by Paul and the evangelists. So Paul's "gospel" was not unique by any means but had been taught in all the world for thousand of years among the nation who worshipped the sun.** All this information is laid out for your inspection: <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>.

This Angelic-Messiah had evolved from the Pythagorean synthesis of Indian and Buddhist beliefs which they themselves had assimilated from Egypt. Thus we find the blending of a sun-g-dman and an earthly Davidic Messiah-king. This will not be a problem until the death of Jesus and the application of these cosmic sun-g-d myths to him following the Essenes converting to the Jesus Movement following his crucifixion.

Acts 6:7 7 And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith. (KJV)

Simply said these Essenes priests became believers and followers of Jesus and entered the Jesus Movement after his crucifixion. One should not forget that what began as a righteous separation from the Temple by the Zadok priests in the early second century B.C.E. would later evolve into the current "Essenes" of Jesus' day. It should be remembered that these Essenes were once considered priest of Zadok: The word "Zadok" in Hebrew means:

6659Tsadowq- Zadok = "righteous";

Zadok was the high priest, son of Ahitub of the house of Eleazar the son of Aaron, and 11th in descent from Aaron; he joined David after Saul's death and supported him against Absalom and Adonijah; and later anointed Solomon as king. In the time of Jesus the Zadoks no longer had connections to the Temple.

When these remnant Essenic priests converted they brought their cosmic redeemer theology with them and applied this to a crucified Jesus in the same motif as their beliefs in their sun-myths. Now we have the Pharisees expecting a Davidic Messiah and these Essenes expecting a g-dman crucified. The New Testament contains both "theologies" jumbled together thanks to the writers of the New Testament. To understand how these Essenes understood that the Angel-Messiah was to be crucified one needs to understand how they believed in a crucified sun-g-dman redeemer. I suggest you go to our website and read up on it: <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>.

That, "we hear very little of them (the Essenes) after A.D. 40; and there can hardly be any doubt that the Essenes as a body must have embraced Christianity" Christian Ginsburg, The Essenes, 1864.

Thus you can easily see how these Essene Buddhist of the first century A.D. brought their religious ideas and beliefs concerning the Angel-Messiah with them. Later those influenced by this theological thought center of Alexandria, with its great library and its university, will write from this perspective and viewpoint, and we, two thousand years later when reading such materials, will not have the facts to understand why people wrote that Jesus was a g-d, etc. The early Greek Church Fathers, many of which grew up in Alexandria and were schooled there, could not help be influenced by such religious ideas. That is why many of their writings contain such ideas not found in the Jewish Bible and its teachings on Messiah.

THE SOLUTION TO THE PROBLEM

The sacred books of Hindus and Buddhists were among the Essenes, and in the library at Alexandria. **The Essenes, who were afterwards called Christians, applied the legend of the Angel-Messiah-"** the very ancient Eastern doctrine," which I have both read and researched out beyond satisfaction, but also have such information delineated at our own personal website: <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>. We have shown throughout this site how the Gentile nations personified their sun-myths into a "pattern" redeemer. The nations, having seen the same things in the heavens, have quite similarity in their myths. Over time, however, would come *additions* to the legend from other sources. That is why the myths are similar, yet divergent.

Portions of the legends related of the Persian, Greek and Roman Saviours and Redeemers of mankind, were, from time to time, added to the already legendary history of the Christian Saviour. This is especially prominent by the Essenes whose writings already had deviated from the Jewish Bible and contained similar sun-g-d myths within their "holy scriptures."

Thus history was repeating itself. Thus the virgin-born God and Saviour, worshiped by all nations of the earth, though called by different names, was but one and the same.

Albert Reville' says:

"Alexandria, the home of Philonism, and Neo-Platonism, was naturally the center whence spread the dogma of the deity of Jesus Christ." In that city, through the third century, flourished a school of transcendental theology, afterwards looked upon with suspicion by the conservators of ecclesiastical doctrine, but not the less the real cradle of orthodoxy. It was still the Platonic tendency which influenced the speculations of [Clement](#), Origen and Dionysius, and the theory of the Logos was at the foundation of their *theology*."

Among the numerous gospels in circulation among the Christians of the first three centuries, there was one entitled The Gospel of the Egyptians.

"Epiphanius (A. D. 385), speaking of it, says :

"Many things are proposed (in this Gospel of the Egyptians) in a bidden, *mysterious* manner, as by our Saviour, as though he had said to his disciples, that the Father was the same person, the Son the same person, and the Holy Ghost the same person."

That this was one of the "scriptures" of the Essenes, becomes very evident when we find it admitted by the most learned of Christian theologians that it was in existence *"before either of the canonical Gospels,"* and that **it contained the doctrine of the Trinity, a doctrine not established in the Christian church until A. D. 327, but which was taught by this Buddhist sect in Alexandria, in Egypt,** which has been well called, "Egypt, the land of Trinities."

The learned Dr. Grabe thought it was composed by *some Christians in Egypt*, and that it was published *before either of the canonical Gospels*. Dr. Mill also believed that it was composed *before either of the canonical Gospels*, and, what is more important than all, **that the authors of it were Essenes.**

These" Scriptures" of the Essenes were undoubtedly amalgamated with the "Gospels" of the Christians, the result being the canonical Gospels as we now have them. The "Gospel of the Hebrews," and such like, on the one band, and the "Gospel of the Egyptians," or Essenes, and such like, on the other. That the "[Gospel of the Hebrews](#)" spoke of Jesus of Nazareth as the son of Joseph and Mary, *according to the flesh*, and that it taught nothing about his miracles, his resurrection from the dead, and other such prodigies, is admitted on all hands. **That the "Scriptures " of the Essenes contained the whole legend of the Angel-Messiah, which was afterwards added to the history of Jesus, making him a CHRIST, or an Anointed Angel, is a probability almost to a certainty.**

This information should now help you to better understand how all the traditions and legends, originally Indian,

escaping from the great focus through *Egypt*, were able to reach Judea, Greece and Rome. Besides that you now should be able to see how Alexandria, the center for Essenic study, aided by the great library and university, was the mecca for the synthesis of religious ideas from Iran, Egypt, the Orient, Persia, Israel, etc. Out of this theological mix will come a great synthesis of the Phythagoreans to which the Essenes would not be immune. We have the blending of a little bit of everything as it is later applied to Jesus. The early Greek philosophers were not immune from such influences; thus we find as early as 110 A.D. Church Fathers from Alexandria teaching concerning the Angel Messiah of the Essenes; however one thing is different, they give him a name; Jesus.



THE ESSENE INFLUENCE AT ALEXANDRIA ON THE TRANSLATION OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES INTO GREEK (LXX)

Answer for yourself: Why did Christianity prosper, and why was Jesus of Nazareth believed to be a divine incarnation and Saviour when no such teachings can be found in the Jewish Masoretic Text of the Tanakh?

There were many causes for this, but as we can devote volumes to the subject, I will try to treat it briefly.

THE INFLUENCE OF THE ESSENES AND THEIR RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEM ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

For many centuries before the time of Jesus there lived a sect of religious monks known as **Essenes, or Therapeutae**. Numerous bodies of ascetics (Therapeutae), especially near Lake Mareotis, devoted themselves to discipline and study, abjuring society and labor, and forgetting it is said, the simplest wants of nature, in contemplating the hidden wisdom of the Scriptures. **Eusebius even claimed them as Christians** and some of the forms of monasticism (by Christians) were evidently modeled after the Therapeutae" (Smith's Bible Dictionary, art, "Alexandria").

Answer for yourself: What happened to the Essenes, for after all, we have their existing theological literature from the Dead Sea Scroll?

"An in-depth study of early church history will show you that the Essenes entirely disappeared from history shortly after the time assigned for the crucifixion of Jesus"...Christian Ginsburg, The Essenes: Their History And Doctrines, 1864.

Simply said these Essenes became believers and followers of Jesus and entered the Jesus Movement after his crucifixion. One should not forget that what began as a righteous separation from the Temple by the Zadok priests in the early second century B.C.E. would later evolve into the current "Essenes" of Jesus' day. The word "Zadok" in Hebrew means:

6659 Tsadowq- Zadok="righteous";

Zadok was the high priest, son of Ahitub of the house of Eleazar the son of Aaron, and 11th in descent from Aaron; he joined David after Saul's death and supported him against Absalom and Adonijah; and later anointed Solomon as king

Acts 6:7 7 And the word of God increased; and the number of the disciples multiplied in Jerusalem greatly; and a great company of the priests were obedient to the faith. (KJV)

These priests were not the traditional Sadducees of the day in league with Rome. These were the Essenic residue of the Zadok priesthood which no longer had control or ties with the Temple. There were thousands of them, and their *monasteries* were to be counted by the score. C.F.D. Moule, of page 13 of his The Birth Of The New Testament, says: "...we have some idea, through the accounts of the Essenes in Philo and Josephus, and recently, through the Qumran writings of how differently a sectarian, but still priestly, group might be behaving at the same time. **Evidently the Qumran sect maintained a priesthood and a ritual organization.**"

Many have asked the question, "What became of these priestly Essenes?" If we examine this group and their religious beliefs we find:

- **That they were expecting the advent of an *Angel-Messiah***
- **That they considered Jesus of Nazareth to be this *Angel-Messiah***
- **That they came over to Christianity in a body; and,**
- **That they brought the legendary histories of the former *Angel-Messiahs* as taken from their sun-myths.**

The origin of the sect known as **Essenes** is enveloped in mist, and will probably never be revealed fully. To speak of all the different ideas entertained as to their origin would make a volume of itself, we can therefore but glance at the subject. I am indebted to many authors for their informative books on the Essenes who have given us the ability to understand the religious climate of the first century in Palestine; authors like James Charlesworth, Lawrence Schiffman, A. DuPont-Summer, John Allegro, Hugh Schonfield, Millar Burrows, Geza Vermes, Hershel Shanks, and especially Martin Larson for his excellent treatment of the Essenes and their evolution as a sect within Judaism of the Second Temple Period in his many books [The Story Of Christian Origins, The Essene Christian Faith, The Essene Heritage, On The Religion Of The Occident].

What escapes most Christian writers today is that the Essenes contemporary with the Jesus era are completely different in theology and scope from the original Zaddok Priests of Qumran from the early second century B.C.E. which were Torah believers. What began as a righteous "separatist movement" by the Zadok priesthood since being prevented from returning to their rightful priesthood following Israel's victory over Antiochus Epiphanies, they protested the Hasmoneans' control of the Temple and possession of the Priesthood by separating from the Temple cult and beginning a "New Israel" and a "New Covenant" in the desert of Qumran. **Sadly, what began as a righteous movement of Judaism will culminate in the days of Jesus and following in a synchronistic Pythagorean-Buddhist-Jewish sect containing a synthesis of religious beliefs built upon astrology and sun-worship mixed with their Jewish heritage; many of these "Essene" beliefs deviated significantly from conservative Torah faith and the traditional Messianic hope.** One must look deeper than the superficial accounts of the Essenes provided by Pliny, Philo, and Josephus to acquaint oneself with such facts, as their accounts are somewhat superficial in many aspects and tend to provide only summaries of the sect and their beliefs. In-depth theological analysis of their beliefs is not possible from these accounts; one must be quite familiar with the individual writings to be able to understand the nuances of their theology.

Theophilus Gale, who wrote a work called The Court of the Gentiles, Oxford, 1671, undoubtedly hits upon the truth when he says:

"Now, the origination or rise of these Essenes (Jewish sect of apocalyptic believers) I conceive by the best conjectures I can make from antiquity, *to be in or immediately after the Babylonian captivity*, though some make them later."

With such an admission one must understand that implied in "Babylonian captivity" is the borrowing of many theological beliefs by the returning Jews from their captors. Needless to say, the Persian victory over the Babylonians only furthered such borrowing of beliefs as these captive Jews were now introduced into the Persian Mysteries and Zoroastrianism. Now it is understandable with the Jewish nation's return by Cyrus to Palestine that another "mixed multitude" was to find its way to Palestine as had once before again possessing a syncretism of beliefs; the irony of the whole story is found that behind the Jewish, Babylonian, and Persian beliefs was an Egyptian religious substrate that had contributed to all of the above as well. The out-working of such beliefs are to be found the the new Apocalyptic of the Jewish faith held by some, but not all. Thus we find in the Judaism that developed after the return from Babylonian captivity the multitude of competing "sects" all with varying religious belief systems.

This new Apocalyptic literature consists of those parts of the Jewish Bible and other Jewish and Christian books that embody an apocalypse, or revelation, given through a symbolic vision of the future. Apocalyptic literature concerns the final period of world history, and depicts the final confrontation between God and the powers of evil. The conflict frequently culminates in a world catastrophe; sometimes a messianic figure is responsible for the triumph over evil. It will be here we find the Essenic Angel-Messiah. Frequently the authors recount history up to their own time in symbolic form (as in Dan. 7:1-8) and then give a vision of the future salvation to be brought by God at the end of the present world. Classic examples are the books of Daniel and Revelation. Passages such as Isaiah 24-27, Zechariah 9-14, and Mark 13 belong to this type of literature. Other examples of literature held sacred by the Essenes are Enoch, Jubilees, and the Apocalypse of Baruch today which can be found in the Jewish Pseudepigrapha, as well as the Apocalypse of Peter in the Apocryphal New Testament.

Apocalyptic literature is usually pseudonymous, written under the name of a famous person. Books such as Daniel and Enoch are examples. But St. John, the author of Revelation in the New Testament, apparently wrote in his own name. Sometimes apocalypses, especially the Apocalypse of Adam and others in the literature of Gnosticism, contain elements drawn from Greek Mythology as well as from the Bible and from Jewish tradition. The New Testament contains all of the above.

Many Christian writers trace the origin of the Essenes all the way back to an origin in India (that is where they picked up many of their sun-myths) and were a sort of Buddhist sect. All of these influences will be amalgamated into a complex theological system that found its latest expression among the Essenes of Qumran in the first century A.D. and their literature attests to it.

Gfrorer, who wrote concerning them in 1835, and said that "the Essenes and the Therapeutae (of Egypt) are the same sect, and hold the same views," was undoubtedly another writer who was touching upon historical ground.

PARALLELS WITH THE NEW TESTAMENT

The identity of many of the precepts and practices of *Essenes* and those of the *New Testament* is unquestionable (T.W. Doane, *Bible Myths and Parallels In Other Religions*, 1882, p. 420).

Essenism urged on its disciples to seek first the kingdom of God and his righteousness. The Essenes forbade the laying up of treasures upon earth. The Essenes demanded of those who wished to join them to sell all heir possessions, and to divide it among the poor brethren. The Essenes had all things in common, and appointed one of the brethren as steward to manage the common bag. Essenism put all its members on the same level, forbidding the exercise of authority of one over the other, and enjoining mutual service. Essenism commanded its disciples to call no man master upon the earth. Essenism laid the greatest stress upon being meek and lowly in spirit. The Essenes commended the poor in spirit, those who hunger and thirst after righteousness, the merciful, the pure in heart, and the peacemaker. They combined the healing of the body with that of the soul. They declared that the power to cast out evil spirits, to perform miraculous cures, etc. They taught that such power should be possessed by their disciples as signs of their belief. The Essenes did not swear at all; their

answer was yea, yea, and nay, nay. When the Essenes started on a mission of mercy, they provided neither gold nor silver, neither took coats, neither shoes, but relied on hospitality for support. The Essenes though repudiating offensive war, yet took weapons with them when they went on a perilous journey. The Essenes abstained from connubial intercourse! The Essenes did not offer animal sacrifices, but strove to present their bodies a living sacrifice, holy and acceptable unto God, which they regarded as a reasonable service! It was the great aim of the Essenes to live such a life of purity and holiness as to be the temples of the Holy Spirit, and to be able to prophesy.

Many other comparisons might be made, but these are sufficient to show that there is a great similarity between the two. These similarities have led many Christian writers to believe that Jesus, if he did not belong to this order, was influenced by them. Dr. Ginsburg, an advocate of this theory, says :

"It will hardly be doubted that our Saviour himself belonged to this holy brotherhood. This will especially be apparent when we remember that the whole Jewish community, at the advent of Christ, was divided into three parties, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, and that every Jew had to belong to one of these sects. Jesus, who, in all things, conformed to the Jewish law, and who was holy, harmless, undefiled, and separate from sinners, would therefore naturally associate himself with that order of Judaism which was most congenial to his holy nature. Moreover, the fact that Christ, with the exception of once, was not heard of in public until his thirtieth year, implying that he lived in seclusion with this fraternity, and that though he frequently rebuked the scribes, Pharisees and Sadducees, he never denounced the Essenes, strongly confirms this conclusion" (Ginsburg, *Essenes*, p. 24).

*We hear very little of the Essenes after A.D. 40, therefore, when we read of the "primitive Christians," we are reading of Essenes, and others (Ginsburg, *Essenes*, p. 27).*

Ginsburg tell us: "We hear very little of them after A.D. 40; and there can hardly be any doubt that, owing to the great similarity existing between their precepts and practices and those of primitive Christians, the Essenes as a body must have embraced Christianity" (Dr. Ginsburg, *Essenes*, p. 27).

The similarity of the sentiments of the Essenes, or Therapeutae, to those of the Church of Rome, induced the learned Jesuit, Nicolaus Serarius, to seek for them an honorable origin. He contended therefore, that they were Asideans and derived them from the Rechabites, described so circumstantially in the thirty-fifth chapter of Jeremiah; at the same time, he asserted that the first Christians monks Essenes. (Hardy, *Eastern Monachism*, p. 358).

There is strong evidence to believe the first Christians were Essenes, or as you are more familiar with the term, "Nazarenes."

Mr. King, *Gnostics and their Remains*, on page 1 speaking of the Christian sect called "Gnostics," says:

"Their chief doctrines had been held for centuries before (their time) in many of the cities of Asia Minor. There, it is probable, they first came into existence as "Mystae," upon the establishment of a direct intercourse with India under the Seleucidae and the Ptolemies (Egypt). The colleges of *Essenes* and Megabyzae at Ephesus, the Orphics of Thrace, the Curetes of Crete, are all merely branches of one antique and common religion, and that originally Asiatic.

Again King says:

" The introduction of Buddhism into Egypt and Palestine affords the only true solution of

innumerable difficulties in the history of religion (Ibid., p. 6).

Again:

"That Buddhism had actually been planted in the dominions of the Seleucidae and Ptolemies (Palestine belonging to the former) before the beginning of the third century B.C.E., is *proved* to demonstration by a passage in the Edicts of Asoka, grandson of the famous Chandragupta, the Sandracottus of the Greeks. These edicts are engraven on a rock at Girnur, in Guzerat." Again notice the link to Egypt, in particular we will find Alexandria, Egypt to be of importance in this regard (King, Gnostics and their remains, p. 23).

Eusebius, in quoting from Philo concerning the Essenes, seems to take it for granted that they [the Essenes] and the Christians were one and the same, and from the manner in which he writes, it would appear that it was generally understood so. He says that Philo called them "Worshipers," and concludes by saying:

"But whether he himself gave them this name, or whether at the *beginning* they were so called, when *as yet the name of Christians was not everywhere published*, I think it not needful curiosity to sift out" (Ecc. History, lib. 2, ch. xvii).

This celebrated ecclesiastical historian (Eusebius) considered it very probable that the writings of the Essenic Therapeuts in Egypt had been incorporated into the gospels of the New Testament, and into some Pauline epistles.

His words are:

"It is very likely that the commentaries (Scriptures) which were among them (the Essenes) were the Gospels, and the works of the apostles, and certain expositions of the ancient prophets, such as partly that epistle unto the Hebrews, and also the other epistles of Paul do contain" (Ecc. Hist., lib. 2, ch. xvii).

You need to stop and think about what was just said. The key word was "**incorporated**"! These Essene Therapeuts did not possess the Gospels in Egypt "after their writing;" but had before their writing much that would be incorporated into these "gospels" when they would be written....this would come from their existing theologies long before Jesus ever lived. In other words, stories and doctrines from these Pythagorean-Buddhist Essenes were later to be ascribed to Jesus which had no historical value or relationship to the real man from Galilee. The synthesis of their Egyptian, Babylonian, and Persian religious beliefs would be filtered through Biblical Judaism and like as before "out jumped this golden-calf" which we call the Christian Jesus today. Instead of understanding Jesus as a Jew we attach to him the theologies of pagan nations never knowing that when reading the New Testament today we are reading a lot of Pythagorean-Buddhist theology from their sun-myths and we think we are reading the truth about the Jesus who really lived. Nothing could be further from the truth!

It would be a serious mistake on your part to assume that the above reference to the "Gospels" included the Four Gospels which most are familiar with today since it can be shown that at the destruction of Qumran and the Essenic library and community in 68 A.D. that these particular "Four Gospels" did not yet exist and that no quotes from them can be found prior to roughly 200 A.D. in the early Church Fathers. You should consider this amazing if they yet existed. Yet understand, many such references in the writings of these Church Fathers came from nothing more than oral tradition or possibly some of the hundreds of conflicting "gospels" possessed by competing sects which were in circulation after the death of Jesus as we are informed by the writer of the Gospel today called by the name of Luke.

THE ANGEL-MESSIAH OF THE ESSENES

"The principal doctrines and rites of the Essenes can be connected with the East, with Parsism, and especially with Buddhism. Among the doctrines which Essenes and Buddhists had in common was that of the Angel-Messiah" (Bunsen, The Angel-Messiah, p. vii).

"The New Testament is the Essene-Nazarene Glad Tidings!" (S.F. Dunlap, The Son of Man, p. iii).

Godfrey Higgins says:

"The Essenes were called physicians of the soul, or *Therapeutae*; being resident both in Judea and Egypt. they probably spoke or had their sacred books in Chaldee (Babylon)." He goes on to say:

"These Essenes were Pythagoreans, as is proved by all their forms, ceremonies, and doctrines, and they called themselves the sons of Jesse. If the Pythagoreans or Conobitae, as they are called by Jamblicus, were Buddhists, the Essenes then held many beliefs of Buddhism mixed among their own. Many of the Essenes lived in Egypt, on the lake of Parembolus or Maria, in monasteries. These are the very places in which we formerly found the *Gymnosophists*, or Samaneans, or Buddhist priests to have lived ; which *Gymnosophistae* are placed also by Ptolemy in north-eastern India." Let us stop just a minute to focus on the links we have seen so far that affect the assimilation by the Essenes of other world religions: Egypt, Babylon, Persian, India, and Judaism. The syncretism of religious beliefs is being formed and will find its full expression in the New Testament." He goes on to say:

"Their (the Essenes) parishes, churches, bishops, priests, deacons, festivals are all identically the same (as the Christians). They had apostolic founders ; the manners which distinguished the immediate apostles of Christ; Scriptures divinely inspired; the same allegorical mode of interpreting them, which has since obtained among Christians, and the same order of performing public worship. They had missionary stations or colonies of their community established in Rome, Corinth, Galatia, Ephesus, Phillippi, Colosse, and Thessalonica, precisely such, and in the same circumstances, as were those to whom St. Paul addressed his letters in those places. All the fine moral doctrines which are attributed to the Samaritan Nazarite, and I doubt not justly attributed to him, are to be found among the doctrines of these ascetics" (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. i. p. 747).

And Arthur Lillie says in Buddha and Early Buddhism, p. vi:

"It is asserted by calm thinkers like Dean Mansel that within two generations of the time of Alexander the Great, the missionaries of Buddha made their appearance at Alexandria." In this he was supported by philosophers of the calibre of Schilling and Schopenhauer, and the great Sanscrit authority, Lassen. Renan also sees traces of Buddhist propagandism in Palestine before the Christian era. Hilgenfeld, Muter, Bohlen, King, all admit the Buddhist influence. Colebrooke saw a striking similarity between the Buddhist philosophy and the Pythagoreans. Dean Milman was convinced that the Therapeuts sprung from the "contemplative and indolent fraternities" of India. And, he might have added, the Rev. Robert Taylor in his Diegesis, and Godfrey Higgins in his Anacalypsis have brought strongest arguments to bear in support of this theory"

This is confirmed in the east by the Asoka monuments-in the west by Philo.

Lillie expressly maintains the identity in creed of the higher Judaism and that of the *Gymnosophists* of India

who abstained from the 'sacrifice of living animals', in a word, the Buddhists. It would follow from this that the priestly religion of Babylonia, Palestine, Egypt, and Greece were undermined by certain kindred mystical societies organized by Buddha's missionaries under the various names of Therapeutae, Essenes, Neo-Pythagoreans, Neo-Zoroastrians etc. Thus Buddhism prepared the ground work and the way of Christianity and its interpretation of the Messiah of Israel. (Arthur Lillie, Buddha and Early Buddhism, p. vi).

The doctrine of the "Anointed Angel-Messiah," consisted of :

- 1. The incarnation of a man from heaven...the Angel-Messiah [origin in the sun-myths of Gentile nations]
- 2. The Angel-Messiah as the Creator of the world
- 3. The doctrine of the atoning sacrificial death of the Angel-Messiah through cosmic crucifixion personified on a cross as taken from their sin-myth synthesis (this is not as simple as it sounds because the crucifixion they understood was a personified crucifixion or crossing of orbits of plants and suns...see our website for further understanding and how this concept was later personified and applied to Jesus by the Essenes after his death
- 4. The resurrection on the 3rd day of this Angel-Messiah as determined by the winter solstice and the failure of the sun to rise any higher in the sky for 3 days...again a personification of sun-myths of Gentile nations

What is alarming to those who study enough to see this is that many of the doctrines of Paul can, with more or less certainty, be connected with the Essenes and their Pythagorean -Buddhist-Iranian sun-myths and seem less than a "unique revelation from God." Sad but true in final analysis. It has taken me over 15 years of comprehensive and extensive research to put the puzzle pieces together to see this clearly for myself. Today I see what those courageous men of old tried to tell the masses about the truth of the Christian faith as it has been passed down to us by the Roman juggernaut called the "church." Instead of the faith of Jesus we have a faith derived from sun-myths moulded around him. With the later creation of documents bearing the Apostle's names it is a small miracle that anyone could find the truth about such a matter when the deception has been so extensive. It becomes almost a certainty that Eusebius was right in surmising that Essenic writings have been used by Paul and others who would later write the "gospels" and later apply the Apostle's names to them. The sun-myths were later applied to a Jewish Rabbi and authority was given to them through various writings proposing such beliefs by competing sects to which final authority was later to be given by attaching the names of Matthew, Mark, Luke, and John to them.

Now it should be getting very clear to you that it was not Jesus, but Paul who would be the cause of the separation of the Jews from the Christians (Bunsen, Angel-Messiah, p. 240). The later "Gospels," written under such a Pauline and an Essenic influence thereby attesting to the Angel-Messiah instead of a Davidic human Messiah would be the last straw to break the camel's back along with the repudiation of the Torah by the evolving Gentile Christian community. The Jews had their Palestinian Jewish Scriptures preserved that read completely different from the corrupted Greek translation and they looked yet for the Davidic Messiah and not a cosmic sun-godman as taught in the doctrine of the Angel-Messiah. One only needs to read the Gospel of John and compare it with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels to see we are talking about two very different persons!

The probability, then, that that sect of vagrant quack-doctors, the Therapeutae, who were established in Egypt and its neighborhood many ages before the period assigned by later theologians as that of the birth of Jesus, were the original fabricators of the writings contained in the New Testament, becomes a certainty on the basis of evidence and the positive statement of the historian Eusebius, that "those ancient Therapeutae were Christians, and that their ancient writings were our gospels and epistles."

The Essenes, the Therapeuts, the Ascetics, the Monks, the **Ecclesiastics**, and the Eclectics, are but different names for one and the self-same sect.

The word "*Essene*" is nothing more than the Egyptian word for that of which Therapeutae is the Greek, each of them signifying "healer " or "doctor," and designating the character of the sect as professing to be endued with the miraculous gift of healing; and more especially so with respect to diseases of the mind.

Their name of "*Ascetics*" indicated the severe discipline and exercise of self-mortification, long fastings, prayers, contemplation, and even making of themselves eunuchs for the kingdom of heaven's sake, as did Origen, Melito, and others who derived their Christianity from the same school; Jesus himself is represented to have recognized and approved their practice.

Their name of "*Monks*" indicated their delight in solitude, their contemplative life, and their entire segregation and abstraction from the world, which Jesus, in the Gospel, is in like manner represented as describing, as characteristic of the community of which he was a member.

Their name of "*Eccleastics*" was of the same sense, and indicated their being called out, elected, separated from the general fraternity of mankind, and set apart to the more immediate service and honor of God. From the Greek word "ecclesia" we get the term so often used today: "church."

Answer for yourself: Did you catch the unique name above for the Essenes, Therapeutae, and their Monks? There were called "Ecclesiastics." On the surface this is rather boring until you understand that "ecclesia" is the term from which we get the English translation "church." The name translated from the Greek means "CHURCH". This give a whole new meaning to the passage supposedly where Jesus said he was to build his "Essenic Community." The follow of such an interpolation to the New Testament is readily seen in the fact that Jesus never envisioned a movement of any great length or duration as he expected the appearance imminently of the Kingdom of God well before 70 C.E. He had no 2000 year plan. He was made to have one after the crucifixion by these Ecclesiastics who considered themselves the "New Israel."

THE ALEXANDRIAN LINK AND THE TRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES INTO GREEK

These Essenes had a flourishing university, or corporate body, established upon these principles, at Alexandria in Egypt, long before the period assigned for the birth of Christ Jesus. The Essenes abounded in Egypt, especially about Alexandria (Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., lib. 2, ch. xvii). They esteemed this "corporate body" to such a degree that went so far as to mistranslate on purpose much of the Tanakh to promote their own theological beliefs and theological agenda. I have for your examination overwhelming evidence as to this purposeful mistranslation and adulteration of the Jewish Scriptures at another website: <http://geocities.com/faithofyeshua> where the corruption of the Jewish Bible is revealed and how the Gentile Church only built off such a corrupt substrate owing that they found parallels with such "corrupted texts" with their prior paganism.

C.D.F. Moule, in The Birth Of The New Testament, records for us on page 59 that the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures is "a wildly inaccurate translation." Likewise, Lucetta Mowry, in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church, again tells us on page 11-12: "...the Qumran authors....altered the stories of the Pentateuch by pious and frequently fanciful embellishments. A more serious purpose of alteration was the attempt to use the stories as authoritative expression of the tenants of the Sect....rewriting familiar events of Israel's history and by inserting legendary details to make the Law of Moses correspond with Qumran thought. These documents, together with the commentaries, testify to the Sect's interest in supplementing biblical authority by adapting canonical works to its own purpose. The community desired in particular to prove that its members were the true heirs of Israel's tradition and that the promise of redemption revealed by God to the patriarchs and to Moses now belonged to their brotherhood." This is just the tip of the iceberg and you should understand

that many Greek Fathers of the church, men like Clement of Alexandria, who grew up and was schooled in Alexandria, not only heard this Essene theology and their teachings on the Angel-Messiah, but their documents, even the Greek translation of the Jewish Bible had such tenants of the group included within it. This explains the natural tendency for these early Greek Fathers to accept and promote a theology that was in opposition to what the conservative Jews of Palestine believed as preserved in their Jewish Scriptures, which now read quite differently from the Greek translation of the Essenes in Alexandria.

There are literally hundreds of embellishments, but let me give you one such example as I have dealt with hundreds of examples of the corruption of the Jewish Scriptures when then were translated on another website that you might wish to examine to see the evidence for yourself: <http://faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>.

Now for example... Christian Ginsburg details for us on page 32 of his monumental work The Essenes, Their History and Doctrines, when these Greek-Jews of Alexandria were employed to translate the Prophet and the Psalms into Greek, that they availed themselves of the opportunity to introduce their tenants and rites into their version of the translation. This version is called the Septuagint and is a grossly mistranslated version of the Jewish Scriptures. Millions of Christians are not aware of this and many of the Christian scholars stop short to examine the evidence for themselves; simply they just don't know it happened. Not being able to read Hebrew for themselves, they accept the Greek translation bequeathed to them as if it came for God. Your evaluation of the facts concerning this translation will show you otherwise. One example should suffice to begin your curiosity into the matter. Thus, for instance, when David said "Sacrifice and burn offering thou didst not desire, mine ears has thou opened" (Psalm 40:6) was changed by the Essenes translators of Alexandria to: "Sacrifice and burnt offering thou didst not desire, but a body hast thou prepared me." The Essenes, by changing this verse and taking away and adding to the Word of God introduced three of their tenets:

1. They made the Prophets speak absolutely as if God had entirely rejected sacrifices because they themselves would offer none
2. By dropping my the words, "mine ears has thou opened," they showed disapproval of slavery:

Exod 21:6 6 Then his master shall bring him (his slave) unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or unto the door post; **and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul;** and he shall serve him for ever. (KJV)

3. By substituting "a body has thou prepared me," the were promoting their college of devout Essenes in Alexandria who met together as a body, and whom they believed God had appointed instead of the corrupt Priesthood. This body of Essenes was to be the now corporate "body" of Israel; the New Israel. Along with this the Torah and the Tanakh had been replaced with the religious and Apocalyptic writings of the community.

From this Essene corporate body of the "New Israel" they sent out missionaries promoting their theologies, and had established colonies, auxiliary branches, and affiliated communities, in various cities of Asia Minor, which colonies were in a **flourishing condition before the preaching of St. Paul**. Now you can understand that when Paul went on his journeys preaching "Christ crucified" that this was not a new message to his recipients. Jesus was just another name in a long line of crucified sun-god saviors that had come before. Chrishna crucified was now Christ crucified. There had been a long line of **"personified Sun-god-men"** who were crucified; first in the heavens due to the blending of astrology and religion, and later personified in human terms reflecting the "heroes" of various Indo-Germanic nations since the beginning of time.

Col 1:23 23 If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and **which was preached to every creature which is under heaven;** whereof I Paul am made a minister; (KJV) Notice please Paul used the "past tense" indicating that "his gospel" had already gone into all the world. A little study in comparative religion verifies the truth to his statement.

Answer for yourself: Have you ever wondered what was "the gospel" preached all over the world before Paul took the Christian message? These nations had already received the cosmic sun-myths from these Buddhist-

Essene missionaries which covered according to their own testimony the whole of the known world. So Christ crucified was not a new message, but the personification of sun-myths long held by primitive mankind. Paul was only reiterating what they already knew and this explains the rapid spread of the Christian message...he had to give them nothing new...only a new name for their crucified godman. This also explains why the Jews continually followed Paul on his travels troubling him in their efforts to "undo" his preaching as the men from Jerusalem knew the distortions Paul was preaching about the Jesus that had personally known! Sadly, the New Testament blasts these men as "Judaizers." Redactionist history at its best!

The very ancient and Eastern doctrine of an Angel-Messiah had been applied to Gautama-Buddha, and so it was applied to Jesus Christ by the Essenes of Egypt and of Palestine, who introduced this new Messianic doctrine into Essenic Judaism and Essenic Christianity (Bunsen, Angel-Messiah, p. 255).

In the Pali and Sanscrit texts the word *Buddha* is always used as a *title*, not as a name. It means "The Enlightened One." Gautama Buddha is represented to have taught that he was only one of a long series of Buddhas, who appear at intervals in the world, and who all teach the same system. After the death of each Buddha his religion flourishes for a time, but finally wickedness and vice again rule over the land. Then a new Buddha appears, who again preaches the lost Dharma or truth. The names of twenty-four of these Buddhas who appeared previous to Gautama have been handed down to us. The *Buddhavansa*, or "History of the Buddhas," the last book of the Khuddaka Nikaya in the second Pitca, gives the lives of all the previous Buddhas before commencing its account of Gautama himself ; and the Pali commentary on the Jatakas gives certain details regarding each of the twenty-four (Rhys David, Buddhism, p. 179).

An *Avatar* (one descended from Heaven as an incarnated deity ...from Oriental and Iranian religious beliefs) was expected about every six hundred years. This interval is clearly shown by Mr. Higgins in his Anacalypsis. It should be remembered that Gautama Buddha, the "Angel-Messiah," and Cyrus, the "Anointed" of the Lord, are placed about six hundred years before Jesus, the "Anointed." This cycle of six hundred years was called the "great year." Josephus, the Jewish historian, alludes to it when speaking of the patriarchs that lived to a great age (Josephus, Antiq., bk. i. c. iii.). "From this cycle of six hundred," says Col. Valliancey, "came the name of the bird Phoenix, called by the Egyptians Phenu, with the well-known story of its going to Egypt to burn itself on the altar of the Sun (at Heliopolis) and rise again from its ashes, at the end of a certain period."

MESSIANIC EXPECTATIONS IN THE FIRST CENTURY

At the time of Jesus of Nazareth an Avatar was expected, not by some of the Jews alone, but by most every eastern nation.

"Philo's writings prove the probability, almost rising to a certainty, that already in his time the Essenes did expect an Angel-Messiah as one of a series of divine incarnations. Within about fifty years after Philo's death, Elkesai the Essene applied this doctrine to Jesus, and it was promulgated in Rome about the same time, if not earlier, by the Pseudo-Clementines" (Bunsen, The Angel-Messiah, p. 118).

Many persons were thought at that time to be, and undoubtedly thought themselves to be, the Christ, and the only reason why the name of Jesus of Nazareth was connected with crucifixion and salvation above all others, is because the *Essenes*, who were expecting an Angel-Messiah, espoused it after identifying Jesus with their killed

"Teacher of Righeousness" who was their Avatar. Following the crucifixion and death of Jesus these Essenes made the connection with their "crucified-sun-god man" and made conversion to the Jesus Movement. Had it not been for this almost indisputable fact, the name of Jesus of Nazareth would undoubtedly not be known at the present day as connected with the pagan doctrines which it has been. In place of this would be the truth concerning the Davidic Messiah and the Torah instead of a paganized New Testament which originated from a strong Essenic influence and Alexandrian philosophy of religion which influence the Greeks as well and their writings which today we call "Early Church Fathers." Without such perversion of truth the Jerusalem church's legacy would have succeeded instead of the one of Rome.

Epiphanius, a Christian bishop and writer of the fourth century, says, in speaking of the Essenes:

"They who believed on Christ were called Jessaei (or Essenes), before they were called Christians. These derived their constitution from the signification of the name Jesus, which in Hebrew signifies the same as Therapeutes, that is, a saviour or physician."

Thus we see that, according to Christian authority, the Essenes and Therapeutes are one, and that the Essenes espoused the cause of Jesus of Nazareth, accepted him as an Angel-Messiah, and became known to history as Christians, or believers in the Anointed Angel.

This ascetic Buddhist sect called Essenes were therefore expecting the Angel-Messiah, because Gautama announced to his disciples that another Buddha, and therefore another angel in human form, another organ or advocate of the wisdom from above, would descend from heaven to earth, and would be called the "Son of Love."

The learned Thomas Maurice says:

"From the earliest post-diluvian age, to that in which the Messiah appeared, together with the traditions which so expressly recorded the fall of the human race from a state of original rectitude and felicity, there appears, from an infinite variety of hieroglyphic monuments and of written documents, to have prevailed, from generation to generation, throughout all the regions of the higher Asia, a uniform belief that, in the course of revolving ages, there should arise a sacred personage, a mighty deliverer of mankind from the thralldom, of sin and of death. In fact, the memory of the grand original promise, that the seed of the woman should eventually crush the serpent, was carefully preserved in the breasts of the Asiatics; it entered deeply into their symbolic superstitions, and was engraved aloft amidst their mythologic sculptures.'" (Hist. Hindostan, vol. ii. p. 273).

That an Angel-Messiah was generally expected at this time may be inferred from the following facts: Some of the Gnostic sects of Christians, who believed that Jesus was an emanation from God, likewise supposed that there were several AEons, or emanations from the Eternal Father.

Among those who taught this doctrine was *Basilides* and his followers! (Lardner's Works, vol. viii. p 352).

MESSIANIC HOPE BREEDS TOO MANY MESSIAHS

Simon Magus was believed to be "He who should come." Simon was worshiped in Samaria and other countries, as the expected Angel-Messiah, as a God.

Justin Martyr says:

" After the ascension of our Lord into heaven, certain men were suborned by demons as their agents, who said that they were gods (*i.e., the Angel Messiah*). Among these was *Simon*, a certain Samaritan, whom nearly all the Samaritans and a few also of other nations, worshiped, confessing him as a Supreme God" (Apol. 1, ch. xxvi).

His miracles were notorious, and admitted by all. His followers became so numerous that they were to be found in all countries. In Rome, in the reign of Claudius, a statue was erected in his honor.

Clement of Rome, speaking of Simon Magus, says that:

"He wishes to be considered an exalted person, and to be considered 'the Christ.' He claims that he can never be dissolved, asserting that he will endure to eternity. "

Montanus was another person who evidently believed himself to be an Angel-Messiah. He was called by himself and his followers the "Paraclete," or "Holy Spirit" (Lardner's Works, vol. viii. p 593)

Socrates, in his Ecclesiastical History, tells us of one *Buddhas* (who lived after Jesus):

"Who afore that time was called Terebynthus, which went to the coasts of Babylon, inhabited by Persians, and there published of himself many false wonders : that he was born of a virgin, that he was bred and brought up in the mountains, etc."

He was evidently one of the many fanatics who believed themselves to be the Paraclete or Comforter, the "Expected One."

Another one of these *Christ was Apollonius*. This remarkable man was born a few years before the commencement of the Christian era, and during his career, sustained the role of a philosopher, religious teacher and reformer, and a worker of miracles. He is said to have lived to be a hundred years old. From the history of his life, written by the learned sophist and scholar, Philostratus, we glean the following:

Before his birth a god appeared to his mother and informed her that he himself should be born of her. At the time of her delivery, the most wonderful things happened.' All the people of the country acknowledged that he was the "Son of God." As he grew in stature, his wonderful powers, greatness of memory, and marvelous beauty attracted the attention of all. A great part of his time was spent, when a youth, among the learned doctors; the disciples of Plato, Chrysippus and Aristotle. When he came to man's estate, he became an enthusiastic admirer and devoted follower of Pythagoras. His fame soon spread far and near, and wherever he went he reformed the religious worship of the day. He went to Ephesus, like Christ Jesus to Jerusalem, where the people flocked about him. While at Athens, in Greece, he cast out an evil spirit from a youth. As soon as Apollonius fixed his eyes upon him, the demon broke out into the most angry and horrid expressions, and then swore he would depart out of the youth. He put an end to a plague which was raging at Ephesus, and at Corinth he raised a dead maiden to life, by simply taking her by the hand and bidding her arise. The miracles of Apollonius were extensively believed, **by Christians as well as others, for centuries after his time. In the fourth century Hierocles drew a parallel between the two Christs - Apollonius, and Jesus - which was answered by Eusebius, the great champion of the Christian church.**

In it he admits the miracles of Apollonius, but attributes them to sorcery.

Apollonius was worshiped as a god, in different countries, as late as the fourth century. A beautiful temple was built in honor of him, and he was held in high esteem by many of the Pagan emperors. Eunapius, who wrote concerning him in the fifth century, says that his history should have been entitled "*The Descent of a God upon*

Earth."

It is as Albert Reville says:

"The universal respect in which Apollonius was held by the whole pagan world, testified to the deep impression which the life of this Supernatural *Being* had left indelibly fixed in their minds; an expression which caused one of his contemporaries to exclaim, **We have a God living among us.**"

A Samaritan, by name Menander, who was contemporary, with the apostles of Jesus, was another of these fanatics who believed himself to be the Christ. He went about performing miracles, claiming that he was a Savior, "sent down from above from the invisible worlds, **for the salvation of mankind**" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist., lib. 3, ch. xxiii*). He baptized his followers in his own name. His influence was great, and continued for several centuries.

Justin Martyr and other Christian Fathers wrote against him.

Manes evidently believed himself to be "the Christ," or "he who was to come." His followers also believed the same concerning him. Eusebius, speaking of him, says:

"He presumed to represent the person of Christ; he proclaimed himself to be the Comforter and the Holy Ghost, and being puffed up with this frantic pride, chose, as if he were Christ, twelve partners of his new-found doctrine, patching into one heap false and detestable doctrines of old, rotten, and rooted out heresies, **the which he brought out of Persia**" (Eusebius, *Eccl. Hist., lib. 7, ch. xxx*).

The word Manes, says Usher in his *Annals*, has the meaning of Paraclete or Comforter or Saviour. This at once lets us into the secret, a new incarnation, an Angel-Messiah, a Christ, born from the side of his mother, and put to a violent death, flayed alive, and hung up, or crucified, by a king of Persia. This is the teacher with his twelve apostles on the rock of Gualior.

Du Perron, in his *Life of Zoroaster*, gives an account of certain prophecies to be found in the sacred books of the *Persians*. One of these is to the effect that, at successive periods of time, there will appear on earth certain "Sons of Zoroaster," who are to be the result of **immaculate conceptions**. These virgin-born gods will come upon earth for the purpose of establishing the law of God. It is also asserted that Zoroaster, when on earth, declared that in the "latter days" a pure virgin would conceive, and bear a son, and that as soon as the child was born a star would appear, blazing even at noonday, with undiminished splendor. This Christ is to be called *Sosiosh*. He will redeem mankind, and subdue the Devs, who have been tempting and leading men astray ever since the fall of our first parents.

Among the Greeks the same prophecy was found. The Oracle of Delphi was the depository, according to Plato, of an ancient and *secret* prophecy of the birth of a "Son of Apollo," who was to restore the reign of justice and virtue on the earth (Plato in *Apolog. Anac.*, ii. p. 189)

Those who believed in successive emanations of AEons from the Throne of Light, pointed to the passage in the Gospels where Jesus is made to say that he will be succeeded by the Paraclete or Comforter. Mohammed was believed by many to be this Paraclete, and it is said that he too told his disciples that **another** Paraclete would succeed him. From present appearances, however, there is some reason for believing, that the Mohammedans are to have their ancient prophecy set at naught by the multiplicity of those who pretend to be divinely appointed to fulfill it. The present year was designated as the period at which this great reformer was to arise, who should be almost, if not quite, the equal of Mohammed. His mission was to be to purify the religion from its corruptions; to overthrow those who had usurped its control, and to rule, as a great spiritual caliph, over the faithful. According to accepted tradition, the prophet himself designated the line of descent in which his most important successor would be found, and even indicated his personal appearance. The time having arrived, it is not strange that the man is forthcoming, only in this instance there is more than one claimant. There is a "holy man" in Morocco who has allowed it to be announced that he is the designated reformer, while cable reports

show that a rival pretender has appeared in Yemen, in southern Arabia, and his supporters, sword in hand, are now advancing upon Mecca, for the purpose of proclaiming their leader as caliph within the sacred city itself.

History then relates to us the indisputable fact that at the time of Jesus of Nazareth an Angel-Messiah was expected, that many persons claimed, and were believed to be, the "Expected One," and that the reason why Jesus was accepted above all others was because the Essenes - a very numerous sect - believed him to be the true Messiah, and came over to be his followers in a body.

It was because there were so many of these *Christs* in existence that some follower of Jesus, but no one knows *who*, wrote as follows:

"If any man shall say to you, Lo, *here is Christ*, or, lo, he is here; believe him not; for *false Christs and false prophets shall rise, and shall show signs and wonders* to seduce, if it were possible, even the elect" (Mark, xiii. 21-22).

The reasons why Jesus was not accepted as the Messiah by the *majority* of the Jews was mainly for two reasons:

1. Because the majority expected a daring and irresistible warrior and conqueror, who, armed with greater power than Caesar, was to come upon earth to rend the fetters in which their hapless nation had so long groaned, to avenge them upon their haughty oppressors, and to re-establish the kingdom of Judah; and this Jesus - although he evidently claimed to be the Messiah - did not do.
2. Besides this the kingdom was to come through righteousness and Israel, expected to be a Holy Nation of Priests, had to merit the Kingdom and her King. Israel's failure in this regard meant the [Messianic prophecies were not fulfilled](#) and the Davidic King redeemer would not succeed. The understanding of such is available to you at:

Tacitus, the Roman historian, says

"The generality had a strong persuasion that it was contained in the ancient writings of the priests, that at that very time the east should prevail : and that some one, who should come out of Judea, *should obtain the empire of the world* ; which ambiguities foretold Vespasian and Titus. But the common people (of the Jews), according to the influence of human wishes, appropriated to themselves, by their interpretation, this vast grandeur foretold by the fates, nor could be brought to change their opinion for the true, by all their adversities."

Suetonius, another Roman historian, says:

"There had been for a long time all over the east a constant persuasion that it was recorded in the fates (books of the fates, or foretellings), that at that time some one who should come out of Judea *should obtain universal dominion*. It appears by the event, that this prediction referred to the Roman emperor ; but the Jews, referring it to themselves, rebelled."

This is corroborated by Josephus, the Jewish historian, who says:

"That which chiefly excited them (the Jews) to war, was an ambiguous prophecy, which was also found in the sacred books, that at that time some one, within their country, should arise. that should obtain *the empire of the whole world*. For this they had received by tradition, that it was spoken of one of their nation; and many wise men were deceived with the interpretation. But, in truth, Vespasian's empire was designed in this prophecy, who

was created emperor (of Rome) in Judea."

As the Rev. Dr. Geikie remarks, the central and dominant characteristic of the teaching of the rabbis, was the certain advent of a great national Deliverer - the Messiah - but not a God from heaven.

For a time Cyrus appeared to realize the promised Deliverer, or, at least, to be the chosen instrument to prepare the way for him, and, in his turn, *Zerubabel* became the center of Messianic hopes. In fact, the national mind had become so inflammable, by constant brooding on this one theme, that any bold spirit, rising in revolt against the Roman power, could find an army of fierce disciples who trusted that it should be he who would redeem Israel (Geikie, The Life Of Christ, vol. i. p. 79).

The "*taxing*" which took place under Cyrenius, Governor of Syria (A. D. 7), excited the wildest uproar against the Roman power. The Hebrew spirit was stung into exasperation; the puritans of the nation, the enthusiasts, fanatics, the zealots of the law, the literal constructionists of prophecy, appealed to the national temper, revived the national faith, and fanned into flame the combustible elements that smoldered in the bosom of the race. The Messianic hope was strong in these people; all the stronger on account of their political degradation. Born in sorrow, the anticipation grew keen in bitter hours. That Jehovah would abandon them could not be believed.

The thought would be atheism. The hope kept the eastern Jews in a perpetual state of insurrection. The cry "Lo here, lo there!" was incessant. Claimant after claimant of the dangerous supremacy of the Messiah appeared, pitched a camp in the wilderness, raised the banner, gathered a force, was attacked, defeated, banished, or crucified; but the frenzy did not abate.

The last insurrection among the Jews, that of Bar-Cochba, "Son of the Star," revealed an astonishing frenzy of zeal. It was purely a *Messianic* uprising. Judaism had excited the fears of the Emperor Hadrian, and induced him to inflict unusual severities on the people. The effect of the violence was to stimulate that conviction to fury. The night of their despair was once more illumined by the star of the east. The banner of the Messiah was raised. Potents, as of old, were seen in the sky; the clouds were watched for the glory that should appear. *Bar-Cochba* seemed to fill all the popular idea of the deliverer. Miracles were ascribed to him; flames issued from his mouth. The vulgar imagination made haste to transform the audacious fanatic into a child of David. Multitudes flocked to his standard. The whole Jewish race throughout the world was in commotion. The insurrection gained head. The heights about Jerusalem were seized and occupied, and fortifications were erected; nothing but the "host of angels" was needed to insure victory.

The angels did not appear; the Roman legions did. The "Messiah," not proving himself a conqueror, was held to have proved himself an impostor, the "son of a lie" (Frothingham, Cradle of the Christ).

The impetuous zeal with which the Jews rushed to the standard of this Messianic impostor, in the 130th year of the Christian era, demonstrates the true Jewish character, and shows how readily any one who made the claim, was believed to be "He who should come." Even the celebrated Rabbi Akiba sanctioned this daring fraud. Akiba declared that the so-called prophecy of Balaam: "*a star shall rise out of Jacob*," was accomplished. Hence the impostor took his title of *Bar-Cockabas*, or *Son of the Star*; and Akiba not only publicly anointed him "KING OF THE JEWS," and placed an imperial diadem upon his head, but followed him to the field at the head of four-and-twenty thousand of his disciples, and acted in the capacity of master of his horse.

In the absence of the fulfillment of the Jewish prophecies in the Jewish Scriptures, faith in Jesus as the Messiah waned, especially in the failure of him to reappear before the destruction of the Temple as well as the war of 135 A.D. Those who yet believed on the meek and benevolent Jesus, and whose number was very small, were of that class who believed in the doctrine of the *Angel-Messiah*, first heard of among them when taken captives to Babylon. The Davidic Messiah did not appear. Hopes were split between the yet coming of the Biblical Messiah with those of the Angel-Messiah of the Essene-Christians. These believed that just as Buddha appeared at different intervals, and as Vishnu appeared at different intervals, the avatars appeared among the Jews. Adam, and Enoch, and Noah, and Elijah or Elias, might in outward appearance be different men, but they were really the self-same divine person successively animating various human bodies! This is clearly seen from the

statement made by the writer of the Gospel of Matthew (xvii:9-13) that the disciples of Jesus supposed John the Baptist was Elias.

The prevailing opinion of the Rabbis and the people alike, in Jesus' day, was, that the Messiah would simply be a great prince, who should found a kingdom of matchless splendor. With a few, however, like the Essene-Christians, the conception of the Messiah's kingdom was pure and lofty...Daniel, and all who wrote after him, painted the "Expected One," as a **heavenly being**. He was the "messenger," the "Elect of God," appointed from eternity, to appear in due time, and redeem his people (Geike, Life of Christ, vol. 1, pp. 80-81). In the book of Daniel, by some supposed to have been written during the captivity, by others as late as Antiochus Epiphanies (B.C.E. 175), the restoration of the Jews is described in tremendous language, and the Messiah is portrayed as a supernatural personage, in close relation with Jehovah himself. In the book of Enoch, supposed to have been written at various intervals between 144 and 120 B.C.E., and to have been completed in its present form in the first half of the second century that preceded the advent of Jesus, the figure of the Messiah is invested with supernatural abilities. He is called "The Son of God," "whose name was spoken before the Sun was made;" "who existed from the beginning in the presence of God," that is, was pre-existent. At the same time his human characteristics are insisted on. He is called "Son of Man," even "Son of Woman," "The Anointed," or "The Christ," "The Righteous One" (Frothingham, The Cradle of the Christ, p. 20).

JESUS AS AN AVATAR

Christ *Jesus* was the avatar of the ninth age, Christ *Cyrus* was the *avatar* of the eighth. Of the hero of the eighth age it is said: "Thus said the Lord to his Anointed (*i.e.*, *His Christ*), his Messiah, to Cyrus, whose right hand I have holden to subdue nations." The eighth period began about the Babylonish captivity, about six hundred years before Christ Jesus.

The ninth began with Christ Jesus, making in all eight cycles before Jesus.

"What was known in Judea more than a century before the birth of Jesus Christ cannot have been introduced among Buddhists by Christian missionaries. It will become equally certain that the bishop and church-historian, Eusebius, was right when he wrote, that he considered it highly probable that the writings of the Essenic Therapeuts in Egypt had been incorporated into our Gospels, and into some Pauline epistles" (Bunsen, The Angel-Messiah, p. 17).

Well there you have it in summary form: How the Jewish Messiah, thought by many to be Jesus, was later interpreted as a Pythagorean-Buddhist-Iranian sun-godman and how the concepts were later blurred as we find today in the writings of the New Testament as quotes from a forged and adulterated Old Testament which was purposefully mistranslated by the Greek-Jewish Essenes of Alexandria to further their authority for their corporate body. With the crucifixion of Jesus these "beliefs" were applied to him following his death and with the conversion of this corporate body into the early Jewish Messianic Movement these "Essenic beliefs" would later divide the conservative Pharisees from the Essenes. The separatist movement would gather steam as the documents of this sect and their teachings highly influenced the Greeks who were coming to the faith as well as their intellectuals which were again influenced by the Alexandrian religious thought. For further information on the subject of the connection between Essenism and Christianity, the reader is referred to Taylor's Diegesis, Bunsen's Angel-Messiah, and the works of S. F. Dunlap.

Let us continue our study to find more truth!



20% off on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



WHAT SCHOLARS HAVE SAID ABOUT THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES (OLD TESTAMENT)

Let me set the stage for what you will see in these articles. There are two completely different "Messiah" in the New Testament; one real and one false. One was the culmination of Eastern and Oriental sun-myths and the other from the Davidic lineage of Israel. They two very different concepts concerning the redeemer to come are blurred in the New Testament. One approaches the New Testament and reads it as if both these concepts were included in Jesus of Nazareth. The later "Gospels" would be written under a Pauline and an Essenic influence; and influence that promoted an Angel-Messiah instead of a Davidic human Messiah. Such a doctrine of the Messiah would be the last straw to break the camel's back and separate the Jewish church from the Gentile church along with the repudiation of the Torah by the evolving Gentile Christian community. **The Jews in Palestine in the days of Jesus had their Palestinian Jewish Scriptures (the Palestinian Masoretic text) preserved and it read completely different from the corrupted Greek translation (Septuagint) and these Jews looked yet for the Davidic Messiah and not a cosmic sun-g-dman as taught in the doctrines of the Angel-Messiah which were added throughout the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures by these Greek-Jews of Alexandria, Egypt.** One only needs to read the Gospel of John and compare it with the Jesus of the Synoptic Gospels to see we are talking about two very different persons!

In other words reading the Gospel attributed to John we read of a g-dman, but when reading the Synoptic Gospels attributed to Matthew, Mark, and Luke, we find a human anointed leader only. But such a dual-Messiahship is not true to the Jewish Scriptures not the beliefs of the Jews who were not looking for a cosmic redeemer but the Messiah of Israel.

The translators of the Jewish Scriptures, the Greek-Jewish Pythagorean-Buddhist sects of Alexandria, Egypt, 200 years before Jesus, wrote "into" their Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures the religious beliefs of their sect intermingled among the pages of their Old Testament translation. **THIS IS A FACT THAT CAN BE SEEN TODAY!** Today we read the Christian Old Testaments, which came from this Greek source, never knowing that such forgery has been done. We fall into the trap of reading such "added sun-myths" and concepts concerning Jesus as quoted in the New Testament, as taken from this corrupted Old Testament, as if they are truths concerning the Jesus of history. Nothing could be further from the truth.

THE SCHOLARS SPEAK CONCERNING THE ALEXANDRIAN LINK AND THE CORRUPTION OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES INTO GREEK

EUSEBIUS

These Essenes had a flourishing university, or corporate body, established upon these principles, at Alexandria

in Egypt, long before the period assigned for the birth of Christ Jesus. The Essenes abounded in Egypt, especially about Alexandria (Eusebius, Eccl. Hist., lib. 2, ch. xvii). They esteemed this "corporate body" to such a degree that went so far as to mistranslation on purpose much of the Tanakh to promote their theological ganteda (Christian Ginsburg, The Essenes , Their History And Doctrines, 1863, p. 32).

C.D.F. MOULE

C.D.F. Moule, in The Birth Of The New Testament, records for us on page 59 that the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures is "a wildly inaccurate translation."

LUCETTA MOWRY

Likewise, Lucetta Mowry, in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church, again tells us on page 11-12: "...the Qumran authors....altered the stories of the Pentateuch by pious and frequently fanciful embellishments. A more serious purpose of alteration was the attempt to use the stories as authoritative expression of the tenants of the Sect....rewriting familiar events of Israel's history and by inserting legendary details to make the Law of Moses correspond with Qumran thought. These documents, together with the commentaries, testify to the Sect's interest in supplementing biblical authority by adapting canonical works to its own purpose. The community desired in particular to prove that its members were the true heirs of Israel's tradition and that the promise of redemption revealed by God to the patriarchs and to Moses now belonged to their brotherhood." This is just the tip of the iceberg and you should understand that many Greek Fathers of the church, men like Clement of Alexandria, who grew up and was schooled in Alexandria, not only heard this Essene theology and their teachings on the Angel-Messiah, but their documents, even the Greek translation of the Jewish Bible had such tenants of the group included within it. This explains the natural tendency for these early Greek Fathers to accept and promote a theology that was in opposition to what the conservative Jews of Palestine believed as preserved in their Jewish Scriptures, which now read quite differently from the Greek translation of the Essenes in Alexandria.

There are literally hundreds of embellishments, but let me give you one such example as I have dealt with hundreds of examples of the corruption of the Jewish Scriptures when then were translated on another website that you might wish to examine to see the evidence for yourself: <http://faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>.

CHRISTIAN GINSBURG

Now for example... Christian Ginsburg details for us on page 32 of his monumental work The Essenes, Their History and Doctrines, when these Greek-Jews of Alexandria were employed to translate the Prophet and the Psalms into Greek, that they availed themselves of the opportunity to introduce their tenants and rites into their version of the translation. This version is called the Septuagint and is a grossly mistranslated version of the Jewish Scriptures. Millions of Christians are not aware of this and many of the Christian scholars stop short to examine the evidence for themselves; simply they just don't know it happened. Not being able to read Hebrew for themselves, they accept the Greek translation bequeathed to them as if it came for God. Your evaluation of the facts concerning this translation will show you otherwise. One example should suffice to begin your curiosity into the matter. Thus, for instance, when David said "Sacrifice and burn offering thou didst not desire, mine ears has thou opened" (Psalm 40:6) was changed by the Essenes translators of Alexandria to: "Sacrifice and burnt offering thou didst not desire, but a body hast thou prepared me." The Essenes, by changing this verse and taking away and adding to the Word of God introduced three of their tenets:

1. They made the Prophets speak absolutely as if God had entirely rejected sacrifices because they themselves would offer none
2. By dropping my the words, "mine ears has thou opened," they showed disapproval of slavery:

Exod 21:6 6 Then his master shall bring him (his slave) unto the judges; he shall also bring him to the door, or

unto the door post; **and his master shall bore his ear through with an aul;** and he shall serve him for ever. (KJV)

3. By substituting "a body has thou prepared me," they were promoting their college of devout Essenes in Alexandria who met together as a body, and whom they believed God had appointed instead of the corrupt Priesthood. This body of Essenes was to be the now corporate "body" of Israel; the New Israel. Along with this the Torah and the Tanakh had been replaced with the religious and Apocalyptic writings of the community.

From this Essene corporate body of the "New Israel" they sent out missionaries promoting their theologies, and had established colonies, auxiliary branches, and affiliated communities, in various cities of Asia Minor, which colonies were in a **flourishing condition before the preaching of St. Paul.** Now you can understand that when Paul went on his journeys preaching "Christ crucified" that this was not a new message to his recipients. Jesus was just another name in a long line of crucified sun-g-d saviors that had come before. Christna crucified was now Christ crucified: <http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>. There had been a long line of **"personified sun-g-dmen"** who were crucified; first in the heavens due to the blending of astrology and religion, and later personified in human terms reflecting the "heroes" of various Indo-Germanic nations since the beginning of time.

Col 1:23 23 If ye continue in the faith grounded and settled, and be not moved away from the hope of the gospel, which ye have heard, and **which was preached to every creature which is under heaven;** whereof I Paul am made a minister; (KJV) Notice please Paul used the "past tense" indicating that "his gospel" had already gone into all the world. A little study in comparative religion verifies the truth to his statement.

Answer for yourself: Have you ever wondered what was "the gospel" preached all over the world before Paul took the Christian message? These nations had already received the cosmic sun-myths from these Buddhist-Essene missionaries which covered according to their own testimony the whole of the known world. So Christ crucified was not a new message, but the personification of sun-myths long held by primitive mankind. Paul was only reiterating what they already knew and this explains the rapid spread of the Christian message...he had to give them nothing new...only a new name for their crucified g-dman. This also explains why the Jews continually followed Paul on his travels troubling him in their efforts to "undo" his preaching as the men from Jerusalem knew the distortions Paul was preaching about the Jesus that had personally known! Sadly, the New Testament blasts these men as "Judaizers." Redactionist history at its best!

THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA

Thus the pseudo-Aristeas, as cited by Josephus; thought, as a matter of fact, **this Septuagint Version, so-called because of the legendary Seventy-two, was in the grossest manner inaccurate, and imported innumerable errors into the Christian religion which was based upon and propagated for several centuries only through the Septuagint texts. Indeed, "the text of the Septuagint was regarded as so unreliable, because of its freedom in rendering, and of the alterations which had been introduced into it, etc., that, during the second century of our era it was discarded by the Church."** (Catholic Encyclopedia. iv, 625.)

In the course of a century or two before the Christian Era, the other Hebrew sacred books were likewise translated into Greek for the use of the Greek-speaking Jews of "the Dispersion," together with numbers of the forged Jewish apocrypha, and all these were added to the rolls of "Scriptures." **This final and adulterated form of the Septuagint "was the vehicle which conveyed these additional Scriptures [i.e. the apocryphal Tobias, etc.] into the Catholic Church."** (Catholic Encyclopedia, iii, 271.)

The role of the Holy Ghost in certifying the ill-translated and tempered Septuagint for the foundations of Christian Faith, was very disastrous, as CE. Points out:

"The Church had adopted the Septuagint as its own; this differed from the Hebrew not only by the addition of

several books and passages but also by innumerable variations of text, due partly to the ordinary process of corruption in the transcription of ancient books, partly to the culpable temerity, as Origen called it, of correctors who used not a little freedom in making 'corrections,' additions, and suppressions, partly to mistakes in translation, and finally in great part to the fact that the original Septuagint had been made from a Hebrew text quite different from that fixed at Jamnia as the one standard by the Jewish Rabbis." (CE. vii, 316.)

"Copies of the Septuagint," says CE., "were multiplied, and, as might be expected, many changes, deliberate as well as involuntary, crept in." (CE. xiii, 723.)

ARTHUR G. PATZIA

Arthur Patzia is associate professor of New Testament and director of Fuller Theological Seminary in Northern California. On the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into the Greek he says this in his book The Making Of The New Testament: "The formation of the LXX was a gradual process spanning several centuries. Scholars have rightly judged that the Letter of Aristeas (B.C.E. 275-295) is a legendary or romantic piece of Jewish propaganda about the origin of the LXX.....But the translation of certain parts of the Old Testament into Greek was not always done consistently and carefully. Some books differ considerable from our present Hebrew Bible.....there are many Old Testament passages in the New Testament which agree with the LXX but differ considerably from the Hebrew Old Testament.....the LXX became identified as the Old Testament of the Christian Church....this led to a Jewish rejection of the LXX in its current form and the production of several other Greek versions that attempted to translate the Hebrew text more accurately...by becoming the Bible of the early church fathers, the LXX influenced church dogma....even the threefold division of Law, Prophets, and Writings was replaced with the Greek fourfold division of Law, History, Poetry, and Prophets" (p. 25-26).

FRANK MOORE CROSS

Frank Moore Cross, in Qumran And The History Of The Biblical Text, says in speaking of the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into the Greek: "these errors and textual diversities between the versions affect the intrinsic message only in relatively few instances. Nevertheless this may occur. **Some examples of variants significant from a theological or ideo-historical angle may in fact be found....**the Septuagint, commonly designated LXX, was in the Pentateuch less open to the uncontrolled impact of translators' idiosyncrasies. It contains indeed fewer deviations from the Hebrew text here than in the renderings of the other books...the ensuing embarrassing textual diversity of the versions of the sacred books soon called for the application of the methods of textual analysis and textual criticism to remedy this deficiency.....the Masoretic manuscripts showed no deviation of any consequence....all (Hebrew manuscripts of the Old Testament known today) exhibited a tradition which was identical to the smallest minutiae....taken as a whole the Greek tradition represented a textual family which differed from the Masoretic text."

MILLAR BURROWS

In Burrows' The Dead Sea Scrolls he says in regard to the Jewish Masoretic text of which we no earlier manuscript evidence than the ninth century until the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls in 1948 say regarding this: "The age of the manuscript, of course, does not establish its importance. An old manuscript is not necessarily a good manuscript. A copy made in the ninth or tenth century A.D. may be more accurately reproduce the original text than one made in the first or second century B.C." [this in response to many Christian commentators which have supposed the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures to be superior to the Jewish Masoretic text because we had "older manuscripts;" thus believing that "oldest" is most accurate]. As you can see this is not always correct!

"Many of the differences between the St. Mark's Isaiah scroll [discovered at Qumran] and the Masoretic text can be explained as mistakes in copying. Apart from these, **there is remarkable agreement, on the whole, with the text found in the medieval manuscripts. Such agreement in a manuscript so much older gives reassuring testimony to the general accuracy of the traditional text...what it shows is that anymajor changes that**

occurred in the translation of the text had already been made before the beginning of the Christian era. In other words, a virtual standardization of the text had come about more or less automatically two or three centuries before the Masoretes made it official. As Hempel puts it, **the decisive history of the text of the Old Testament had already been completed by the time of Jesus, not only in the books of the law, of which no jot or title should be altered, but also in the books of the prophets"** (pp. 303-304).

Let me explain what you just read. The Christian Old Testament, corrupted since the Greek translation from which it was later re-translated, contains many passages interpreted as "messianic" and the church interprets these as if Jesus is the fulfillment. In reality, these are not true "messianic passages" as spoken by the prophets but adulterations meant to promote the sun-g-dmen theology of the translators in Alexandria. As Christians, we read them as if they are "messianic" and apply them to Jesus as if they were originally written concerning him. Needless to say, the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures do not read like this Greek "messianized" translation and many passages which read as if they were "messianic" in the Christian Old Testament were never given by the prophets as recorded in the Christian Bibles. The Christian response, when shown that their Old Testament is completely different in this regard when compared with the Jewish Scriptures, respond that the "Jews changed their Bible in response to the Christian message and tried to write-out Jesus from the Old Testament and "de-messiahize the prophets." This is simply false. As you read from scholar after scholar the Masoretic text, although until recently no copies could be discovered as early as the Greek translations, did not undergo change in reaction to the Christian church and its theology; rather the Masoretic text has been an accurate translation esteemed by the Jews since well before the days of Jesus and the passages that the Christian Church reads as if "messianic" are in reality purposeful corruptions of the Jewish text by the translators of the Jewish Scriptures in Alexandria. In other words, many of the beliefs held and applied to Jesus from this corrupted Old Testament in the Christian Bible are completely false and pagan in origin; and if that was not bad enough, such beliefs renders one an idolator!

Further Burrows states: "Considering how widely the earliest manuscripts of the New Testament vary, how radically, the ancient Greek versions differ from the traditional Hebrew text, and what a long time interval between the Dead Sea Scrolls and the oldest of the medieval manuscripts, one might have expected a much larger number of variant readings and a much wider degree of divergence. It is a matter for wonder that through something like a thousand years the text (of the Jewish Masoretic text) underwent so little alterations" (p. 304).

Now listen to what he says that I have already alluded to above: "We must still ask, however, whether the official scribes altered the text to eliminate what they considered objectionable implications, or whether the alteration was made by the covenanters [Essenes] to introduce their own beliefs into the text [beliefs about the Angel-Messiah in contrast to the Davidic Messiah]. That the latter procedure would not have been out of the question is shown by what was done by what was done with the text of Habakkuk..." (p. 313).

Again, "We cannot pause here to discuss each of those variants, but anyone who carefully examines the passages in question will find that the supposed Messianic implications are decidedly questionable" (p. 313).

Again, in contrasting the LXX and the Masoretic text he says: "By and large it confirms the antiquity and authenticity of the Masoretic text. Where it departs from the traditional text, the latter (the Masoretic text) is usually preferable" (p. 314).

ST. AUGUSTINE

Augustine, in his City of God 15:14 speaking of these Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures states: "Apart from the errors of copyists, there are discrepancies which may conform to and even emphasize the truth. In such cases, we may well believe that **the translators were inspired by divine Spirit to depart deliberately from the original, for along with their duties as scholars they had rights as prophets. [WHAT?]** This explains why as Apostles rightly lend their authority not only to the Hebrew text but also the Septuagint, as when they quote Scripture texts from the latter."

Answer for yourself: Did you hear what he just said...that the Holy Spirit inspired these translators to depart deliberately from the original Words of God? What did YHVH warn us about adding to or taking away from His Word? Then how can we rightfully understand that God lied as Augustine just said?

THE PESHITTA HOLY BIBLE...GEORGE LAMSA'S TRANSLATION

The versions translated from Semetic languages into Greek and Latin were subject to constant revisions. Learned men who copied them introduced changes.....The Septuagint was made in the 3rd century B.C., for the Alexandrian Jews. This version was never officially read by the Jews in Palestine who spoke Aramaic and read Hebrew. Instead, the Jewish authorities condemned the work and declared a period of mourning because of the defects in the version. Evidently Jesus and his disciples used a text which came from an older Hebrew original. This is apparent because Jesus' quotations from the Old Testament agree with the Peshitta text but do not agree with the Greek text (Peshitta, pp. vi-ix).



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



A HISTORICAL ACCOUNT OF THE TRANSLATION OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES INTO GREEK...AS TAKEN FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF THE SEPTUAGINT (LXX)

The earliest version of the Old Testament Scriptures which is extant, or of which we possess any certain knowledge, is the translation executed at Alexandria in the third century before the Christian era: this version has been so habitually known by the name of the Septuagint, that the attempt of some learned men in modern times to introduce the designation of the Alexandrian version (as more correct) has been far from successful.

The history of the origin of this translation was embellished with various fables at so early a period that it has been a work of patient critical research in later times to bring into plain light the facts which may be regarded as well authenticated.

We need not wonder that but little is known with accuracy on this subject; for, with regard to the ancient versions of the Scriptures in general, we possess no information whatever as to the time or place of their execution, or by whom they were made: we simply find such versions in use at particular times, and thus we gather the fact that they must have been previously executed. If, then, our knowledge of the origin of the Septuagint be meager, it is at least more extensive than that which we possess of other translations.

After the conquests of Alexander had brought Egypt under Macedonian rule, the newly-founded city of Alexandria became especially a place where the Greek language, although by no means in its purest form, was the medium of written and spoken communication amongst the varied population there brought together. This Alexandrian dialect is the idiom in which the Septuagint version was made.

Amongst other inhabitants of Alexandria the number of Jews was considerable: many appear to have settled there even from the first founding of the city, and it became the residence of many more during the reign of the first Ptolemy. Hence the existence of the sacred books of the Jews would easily become known to the Greek population.

The earliest writer who gives an account of the Septuagint version is Aristobulus, a Jew who lived at the commencement of the second century B.C. He says that the version of the Law into Greek was

completed under the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and that Demetrius Phalereus had been employed about it. Now, Demetrius died about the beginning of the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, and hence it has been reasonably inferred that Aristobulus is a witness that the work of translation had been commenced under Ptolemy Soter.

Different opinions have been formed as to what is intended by Aristobulus when he speaks of the Law: some consider that he refers merely to the Pentateuch, while others extend the signification to the Old Testament Scriptures in general: **the former opinion appears to be favored by the strict meaning of the terms used,** the latter by the mode in which the Jews often applied the name of Law to the whole of their sacred writings.

The fact may, however, be regarded as certain, that prior to the year 285 B.C. the Septuagint version had been

commenced, and that in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus, either the books in general or at least an important part of them had been completed.

The embellishments and fictitious additions which this account soon received might be scarcely worthy of notice in this place, were it not that they are intimately connected with the authority which this version was once supposed to possess, and with the name by which it is commonly known.

A writer, who calls himself **Aristeas**, says that when Ptolemy Philadelphus was engaged in the formation of the Alexandrian Library, he was advised by Demetrius Phalereus to procure a translation of the sacred books of the Jews. The king accordingly, as a preliminary, purchased the freedom of more than one hundred thousand Jewish captives, and he then sent a deputation, of which Aristeas himself was one, to Eleazar the high-priest to request a copy of the Jewish Law and seventy-two interpreters, six out of each tribe. To this the priest is represented to have agreed; and after the arrival of the translators and their magnificent reception by the king, they are said to have been conducted to an island by Demetrius, who wrote down the renderings on which they agreed by mutual conference; and thus the work is stated to have been completed in seventy-two days. The translators are then said to have received from the king most abundant rewards; and the Jews are stated to have asked permission to take copies of the version.

As stated earlier legends abound concerning the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into the Greek. Other additions were subsequently made to this story: some said that each translator was shut into a separate cell and that all by divine inspiration made their versions word for word alike, others said that there were two in each cell, accompanied by an amanuensis; but at all events miracle and direct inspiration were supposed to be connected with the translation: hence we cannot wonder that the authority attached to this version in the minds of those who believed these stories was almost unbounded.

The basis of truth which appears to be under this story seems to be, that it was an Egyptian king who caused the translation to be made, and that it was from the Royal Library at Alexandria that the Hellenistic Jews received the copies which they used.

In examining the version itself, it bears manifest proof that it was not executed by Jews of Palestine, but by those of Egypt:—there are words and expressions which plainly denote its Alexandrian origin: this alone would be **a sufficient demonstration that the narrative of Aristeas is a mere fiction.** It may also be doubted whether in the year 285 B.C. there were Jews in Palestine who had sufficient intercourse with the Greeks to have executed a translation into that language, for it must be borne in mind how recently they had become the subjects of Greek monarchs, and how differently they were situated from the Alexandrians as to the influx of Greek settlers.

Some in rejecting the fabulous embellishments have also discarded all connected with them: they have then sought to devise new hypotheses as to the origin of the version. Some have thus supposed that the translation was made by Alexandrian Jews for their own use, in order to meet a necessity which they hail felt to have a version of the Scriptures in the tongue which had become vernacular to them.

There would be, however, many difficulties in the way of this hypothesis. We would hardly suppose that in a space of thirty-five years the Alexandrian Jews had found such a translation needful or desirable: we must also bear in mind that we find **at this period no trace of any versions having been made by Jews into the languages of other countries in which they had continued for periods much longer than that of their settlement at Alexandria.**

The most reasonable conclusion is, that the version was executed for the Egyptian king; and that the Hellenistic Jews afterwards used it as they became less and less familiar with the language of the original (Hebrew).

If the expression of Aristobulus does not designate the whole of the books of the Old Testament as translated in the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus, the question arises, **when were the other books besides the Pentateuch**

turned into Greek? To this no definite answer could be given: we may however be certain that various interpreters were occupied in translating various parts, and in all probability the interval between the commencement and the conclusion of the work was not great.

The variety of the translators is proved by the unequal character of the version: some books show that the translators were by no means competent to the task, while others, on the contrary, exhibit on the whole a careful translation. The Pentateuch is considered to be the part the best executed, while the book of Isaiah appears to be the very worst.

In estimating the general character of the version, it must be remembered that the translators were Jews, full of traditional thoughts of their own as to the meaning of Scripture; and thus nothing short of a miracle could have prevented them from infusing into their version the thoughts which were current in their own minds. They could only translate passages as they themselves understood them. This is evidently the case when their work is examined.

[Let me interject that you think about what you just read and then try to reason with yourself that such a translation could even possibly be considered inspired, infallible, and inerrant. This alone testifies to the numerous contradictions when compared to the Jewish Masoretic Text]

It would be, however, too much to say that they translated with dishonest intention; for it cannot be doubted that they wished to express their Scriptures truly in Greek, and that their deviations from accuracy may be simply attributed to the incompetency of some of the interpreters, and the tone of mental and spiritual feeling which was common to them all.

One difficulty which they had to overcome was that of introducing theological ideas, which till then had only their proper terms in Hebrew, into a language of Gentiles, which till then had terms for no religious notions except those of heathens. Hence the necessity of using words and phrases in new and appropriated senses.

These remarks are not intended as depreciatory of the Septuagint version: their object is rather to show what difficulties the translators had to encounter, and why in some respects they failed; as well as to meet the thought which has occupied the minds of some, who would extol this version as though it possessed something resembling coordinate authority with the Hebrew text itself.

[There you have the redactor of the LXX testifying to the inferior authority of the LXX when compared with the Jewish Scriptures]

One of the earliest of those writers who mention the Greek translation of the Scriptures, speaks also of the version as not fully adequate. The Prologue of Jesus the son of Sirach (written as many suppose B.C. 130) to his Greek version of his grandfather's work, states: **"For the same things expressed in Hebrew have not an equal force when translated into another language. Not only so, but even the Law and the prophecies and the rest of the books differ not a little as to the things said in them."** The writer of this Prologue had come into Egypt from the Holy Land: he had undertaken the translation of his grandfather's work into Greek, but in explanation of the difficulty which he had to encounter in this work, he refers to the defects found even in the version of the Law, the prophets, and the other books, of which he had previously spoken. Doubtless coming into Egypt he was more conscious of the defects of the Septuagint version than could have been the case with Egyptian Jews, who had used the translation commonly and habitually for a century and a quarter,

At Alexandria the Hellenistic Jews used the version, and gradually attached to it the greatest possible authority: from Alexandria it spread amongst the Jews of the dispersion, so that at the time of our Lord's birth it was the common form in which the Old Testament Scriptures had become diffused.

In examining the Pentateuch of the Septuagint in connection with the Hebrew text, and with the copies

preserved by the Samaritans in their crooked letters, it is remarkable that in very many passages the readings of the Septuagint accord with the Samaritan copies where they differ from the Jewish. We cannot here notice the various theories which have been advanced to account for this accordance of the Septuagint with the Samaritan copies of the Hebrew; indeed it is not very satisfactory to enter into the details of the subject, because no theory hitherto brought forward explains all the facts, or meets all the difficulties. To one point however, we will advert, because it has not been sufficiently taken into account,—in the places in which the Samaritan and Jewish copies of the Hebrew text differ, in important and material points, the Septuagint accords much more with the Jewish than with the Samaritan copies, and in a good many points it introduces variations unknown to either.

The Septuagint version having been current for about three centuries before the time when the books of the New Testament were written, it is not surprising that the Hellenistic writers of the New Testament should have used it more often than not in making citations from the Old Testament. They used it as an honestly-made version in pretty general use at the time when they wrote. They did not on every occasion give an authoritative translation of each passage, but they used what was already familiar to the ears of converted Hellenists {thus the parallels to their existing heathen legends worked in among the texts}, when it was sufficiently accurate to suit the matter in hand. In fact, they used it as did their contemporary Jewish writers, Philo and Josephus, but not, however, with the blind implicitness of the former.

In consequence of the fact that the New Testament writers used on many occasions the Septuagint version, some have deduced a new argument for its authority,—a theory which we might have thought to be sufficiently disproved by the defects of the version, which evince that it is merely a human work. But the fact that the New Testament writers used this version on many occasions supplies a new proof in opposition to the idea of authority, for in not a few places they do not follow it, but they supply a version of their own which rightly represents the Hebrew text, although contradicting the Septuagint.

The use, however, which the writers of the New Testament have made of the Septuagint version must always invest it with a peculiar interest; we thus see what honor God may be pleased to put on an honestly-made version, since we find that inspired writers often used such a version, when it was sufficiently near the original to suit the purpose for which it was cited, instead of rendering the Hebrew text exactly on every occasion.

Another important point on which the Septuagint stands in close connection with the New Testament is the general phraseology of the version,—a phraseology in which the traces of Hebrew elements are most marked, but with regard to which we should mistake greatly if we supposed that it originated with the New Testament writers. Thus we may see that the study of the Septuagint is almost needful to any biblical scholar who wishes to estimate adequately the phraseology of the New Testament.

Besides the direct citations in the New Testament in which the Septuagint is manifestly used, there are not a few passages in which it is clear that the train of expression has been formed on words and phrases of the Septuagint: thus an intimate acquaintance with this version becomes in a manner necessary on the part of an expositor who wishes to enter accurately into the scope of many parts of the New Testament.

Thus, whatever may be our estimate of the defects found in the Septuagint—its inadequate renderings, its departures from the sense of the Hebrew, its doctrinal deficiencies owing to the limited apprehensions of the translators—there is no reason whatever for our neglecting the version, or not being fully alive to its real value and importance. But one, when he studies this out, must be alert that within it exists major departures from the sense of the Hebrew that is manifested in doctrinal errors from the pens of its translators!

After the diffusion of Christianity, copies of the Septuagint became widely dispersed amongst the new communities that were formed; so that before many years had elapsed this version must have been as much in the hands of Gentiles as of Jews.

The veneration with which the Jews had treated this version (as is shown in the case of Philo and Josephus), gave place to a very contrary feeling when they found how it could be used against them in argument due to its inadequate translations and its doctrinal changes: hence they decried the version, and sought to deprive it of all authority. As the Gentile Christians were generally unacquainted with Hebrew, they were able to meet the Jews on the ground which they now took; and as the Gentile Christians at this time believed the most extraordinary legends of the origin of the version, so that they fully embraced the opinions of its authority and inspiration, **they necessarily regarded the denial on the part of the Jews of its accuracy, as little less than blasphemy, and as a proof of their blindness. But being incapable of reading and translating the Hebrew thereby seeing the discrepancies, it was they who were blinded to the alterations, substitutions, and doctrinal inadequacies of the Septuagint!**

In the course of the second century, three other complete versions of the Old Testament into Greek were executed: these are of importance in this place, because of the manner in which they were afterwards connected with the Septuagint.

The first of the Greek versions of the Old Testament executed in the second century was that of Aquila. He is described as a Jew or Jewish proselyte of Pontus, and the date commonly attributed to his version is about the year A.D. 126. **His translation is said to have been executed for the express purpose of opposing the authority of the Septuagint: his version was in consequence upheld by the Jews.** His labor was evidently directed in opposing the passages which the Christians were accustomed to cite from the Septuagint as applicable to the Lord Jesus. The general characteristic of this version is bold literalness of rendering: such an endeavor is made to render each Hebrew word and particle into Greek, that all grammar is often set at defiance, and not infrequently the sense is altogether sacrificed. From the scrupulosity of Aquila in rendering each Hebrew word, his work, if we possessed it complete (and not merely in scattered fragments), would be of great value in textual criticism.

Another Greek translator at a subsequent period in the second century was Symmachus. He is described as an Ebionite, a kind of semi-Christian. His version seems to have been executed in good and pure Greek perhaps he was the more particular in his attention to this in consequence of the mere barbarism of Aquila.

A third translator in the same century was Theodotion, an Ebionite like Symmachus, to whom he was probably anterior. His version is in many parts based on the Septuagint. He is less servile in his adherence to the words of the Hebrew than Aquila, although he is void of the freedom of Symmachus. His knowledge of Hebrew was certainly but limited, and without the Septuagint it is hardly probable that he could have undertaken this version.

Thus, before the end of the second century there were, besides the Septuagint, three versions of the Old Testament in Greek, known to both Jews and Christians. All this could not fail in making the Old Testament Scriptures better known and more widely read.

Although many Christians believed in the inspiration and authority of the Septuagint, yet this could not have been universally the case; otherwise the disuse of the real Septuagint version of the book of Daniel, and the adoption of that of Theodotion in its stead, could never have taken place. **This must have arisen from an apprehension of the poverty and inaccuracy of the Septuagint in this book, so that another version similar in its general style was gladly adopted.**

We have now to speak of the labors of Origen in connection with the text of the Septuagint. This learned and enterprising scholar, having acquired a knowledge of Hebrew, **found that in many respects the copies of the Septuagint differed from the Hebrew text.** It seems to be uncertain whether he regarded such differences as having arisen from mistakes on the part of copyists, or from errors of the original translators themselves.

The object which he proposed to himself was not to restore the Septuagint to its original condition, nor yet to correct mere errors of translation simply as such, but to cause that the Church should possess a text of the Septuagint in which all additions to the Hebrew should be marked with an obelus, and in which all that the

Septuagint omitted should be added from one of the other versions marked with an asterisk. He also indicated readings in the Septuagint which were so incorrect that the passage ought to be changed for the corresponding one in another version.

With the object of thus amending the Septuagint, he formed his great works, the **Hexapla and Tetrapla**; these were (as the names imply) works in which the page was divided respectively into six columns and into four columns.

The Hexapla contained, 1st, the Hebrew text; 2nd, the Hebrew text expressed in Greek characters; 3rd, the version of Aquila; 4th, that of Symmachus; 5th, the Septuagint; 6th, Theodotion. The Tetrapla contained merely the four last columns.

Besides these four versions of the entire Old Testament, Origen employed three anonymous Greek versions of particular books; these are commonly called the fifth, sixth, and seventh versions. Hence in the parts in which two of these versions are added, the work was designated I Octapla, and where all the three appeared, it was called Enneapla.

References were then made from the column of the Septuagint to the other versions, so as to complete and correct it: for this purpose Theodotion was principally used. This recension by Origen has generally been called the Hexaplar text. The Hexapla itself is said never to have been copied: what remains of the versions which it contained (mere fragments) were edited by Montfaucon in 1714, and in an abridged edition by Bahrdr in 1769-70.

The Hexaplar text of the Septuagint was copied about half a century after Origen's death by Pamphilus and Eusebius; it thus obtained a circulation; but the errors of copyists soon confounded the marks of addition and omission which Origen placed, and hence the text of the Septuagint became almost hopelessly mixed up with that of other versions.

The Hexaplar text is best known from a Syriac version which was made from it; of this many books have been published from a MS at Milan; other books are now in the British Museum amongst the rest of the Syriac treasures obtained from the Nitrian monasteries. This Syro-Hexaplar translation preserves the marks of the Greek text, and the references to the other translations. It may yet be made of great use in separating the readings which were introduced by Origen from those of an older date.

There were two other early attempts to revise the Septuagint besides that of Origen. In the beginning of the fourth century, Lucian, a presbyter of Antioch, and Hesychius, an Egyptian bishop, undertook similar labors of the same kind. These two recensions (which they were in the proper sense of the term) were much used in the Eastern Churches.

From the fourth century and onward, we know of no definite attempt to revise the text of the Septuagint, or to correct the discrepancies of various copies. It is probable, however, that just as the text of the Greek New Testament became in a great measure fixed into the same form as we find it in the modern tropics, something of the same kind must have been the case with the Septuagint. As to the Greek New Testament, this seems to have occurred about the eleventh century, when the mass of copies were written within the limits of the patriarchate of Constantinople. It is probable that certain copies approved at the metropolis, both politically and religiously, of those who used the Greek tongue, were tacitly taken as a kind of standard.

We find amongst the members of the Eastern (churches who use the Greek language), that the Septuagint has been and is still so thoroughly received as authentic Scripture, that any effort to introduce amongst them versions which accurately represent the Hebrew (as has been attempted in modern times) has been wholly fruitless.

Thus the Septuagint demands our attention, were it only from the fact that the whole circle of religious ideas and thoughts amongst Christians in the East has always been molded according to this version, Without an acquaintance with the Septuagint, numerous allusions in the writings of the Fathers become wholly

unintelligible, and even important doctrinal discussions and difficulties (such even as some connected with the Arian controversy) become wholly unintelligible,

As the Septuagint was held in such honor in the East, it is no cause for surprise that this version was the basis of the other translations which were made in early times into vernacular tongues. There was, however, also another reason;—the general ignorance of the original Hebrew amongst the early Christians prevented their forming their translations from the fountain itself. The special exception to this remark is the Syriac version of the Old Testament formed at once from the Hebrew.



WHAT IS THE MASORETIC TEXT AND IS IT IN THE CHRISTIAN'S BIBLE?

YES AND NO! This needs explanation.

The term “Masoretic Text” is the name for the Hebrew text handed down from the Jews since the Babylonian captivity. The word “Masoretic” comes from “masor,” a Hebrew word meaning “traditional.” It means to hand down from person to person. The Masoretes handed down this text from generation to generation, guarded it and kept it well. There were families of Hebrew scholars in Babylon, in Palestine, and in Tiberius. According to most students of these matters, these Masoretes safeguarded the consonantal text of the Jewish Scriptures.

“The Masoretes flourished from about 500 to 1000 A.D. They were supposed to have standardized the Hebrew O.T. in about 600-700 A.D. by putting in the vowel pointings to aid in the pronunciation of the consonantal text. Their text is called the Masoretic Text or M.T. if you want to abbreviate it. Many assume that these Jewish Scriptures, as preserved by these Masoretes, are the “same” Jewish Scriptures contained in their Christian Bibles today. **Nothing could be further from the truth!**

DOES THE CHRISTIAN BIBLE CONTAIN THE JEWISH MASORETIC TEXT....OR HAS IT BEEN ALTERED?

It would be a wonderful thing if in the Christian Bible we had a faithful replication of the Jewish Palestinian Masoretic text but we do not. Therefore the need for ministries like Bet Emet to bring this sad fact to your attention in hopes that your recognition of such a problem will lead to your own investigation into the matter to not only confirm what we have said, but also lead you in repentance of many false religious beliefs you hold as a traditional “Christian.”

In looking over the introductory notes of several of the Bibles I possess I was struck by the statements by several Bible committees guarantying that within their “translations” we have the Jewish Scriptures. One hardly ever approaches one's Christian Bible thinking it could be wrong and thus we, by default, are led astray.

If you open the beginnings of your Christian Bibles you often find in the preface to the Old Testament a commentary detailing how your Christian Old Testament was put together. Granted this is just a collection of summary statements but you can get the drift. Let me give you an example.

The Oxford Study Edition of The New English Bible with Apocrypha states on page xix: “the earliest known Hebrew manuscripts containing any parts of the Old Testament are among the Scrolls (commonly called the Dead Sea Scrolls) found in the caves of Qumran near the north-western end of the Dead Sea; they may be dated in the last two centuries B.C., though some may be a little earlier and others somewhat later.”

So far so good. But watch what they say later:

“The text which they present is to a large extent identical with that in our Hebrew Bibles.”

THAT STATEMENT IS SIMPLY JUST NOT TRUE AND I CAN PROVE IT TO YOU IF YOU WILL LISTEN!

WHAT YOU DON'T KNOW CAN HURT YOU

Most of you would read such a comment **“large extent identical with that in our Hebrew Bibles”** and be reassured that your Christian Old Testament is a faithful representation of the Old Testament in the Jewish Hebrew Bible.

Answer for yourself: What about those portions that do not fall within the above **“To a large extent”**? Do these portions make a major theological difference? Are these differences the reason why the Jews do not accept the Christian's Old Testament and much that is taught about Jesus by the Christian church and their texts?

Answer for yourself: What if I could show you that the above statement as representative of most Christian Old Testaments was a lie?

Over my dedicated fifteen plus years as a serious Bible researcher I have heard it all. The only way to know the truth for yourself is to find it yourself. I set out to do that and I have. And it is this truth I share with you. So many today have “holes” in their beliefs; holes when filled would alter their perspectives. But most study to a superficial level it seems and end up accepting and promoting the “party line” or “denominational position” for acceptability within the fraternity, or being preconditioned to a particular “belief” then when challenged they dismiss their opponents challenges.

What you just read above “that the Christian Old Testament in your Bibles is to a 'large extent identical' with the Hebrew Bible” is a lie spread by those of a particular religious position that produced that particular Bible. I have invested great time and finances to find out what the facts are concerning the changes and differences in the Jewish Hebrew Bible that are **“NOT to a large extent”** the same as the Christian Old Testament.

I have been humbled to say the least by my research and these comparisons and this led directly to my resignation as a Christian Pastor. As my studies progressed during the eight years of my pastorate I came to a place finally where I could no longer continue the charade. I had to resign. Simply said, based on what I discovered the facts were as plain as the nose on my face; I had not been preaching the truth as taught by the Bible Jesus used and read. Then why continue.

SO WHAT IS WRONG WITH THE CHRISTIAN OLD TESTAMENT IN MOST CHRISTIAN BIBLES?

There are basically two major problems with the Christian Old Testament: Doctrine and Prophecy.

The Christian Old Testament is not a faithful representation of the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures in multiple places. Simply said, many DOCTRINES as recorded and taught about Jesus in the New Testament come directly from what is recorded in the Christian's Old Testament. If these doctrines find their origin in a falsified and corrupted Old Testament which the Christian Bibles use, then understand such doctrines in the New Testament are false! That means the quotes in the New Testament are wrong if the sources for them can be shown to be wrong! A simple comparison between the Christian's Old Testament, along with the Septuagint (the corrupted Greek translation of these Jewish Scriptures) against these Jewish Scriptures in the Jewish Tannah will convince even a blind man! You just need to know they exist and that your investigation into the matter will reveal it beyond any doubt.

What I am saying is that what are supposedly “fulfilled prophecies” from the Old Testament in our Christian

Bibles, seen as quotes in the New Testament, are in reality quotes of forgeries in many places because the Christian's Old Testament come from texts which were altered and falsified in the Greek translation of them 200 years before Jesus. Therefore the New Testament's reference to these as "fulfillments," upon examination with the real Jewish Masoretic text, can be shown to but gross falsifications and purposeful mistranslations in many instances. Understand I am not saying "all Messianic prophecy" is corrupted, but much is and you should know about it. There is a big difference when reading the Old Testament and believing what you are reading came from God or from men with a theological agenda. Many of these "doctrines" and "prophecies" were literally "created" by the Pythagorean-Greek Jews of Alexandria which they translated the Jewish Scriptures into Greek.

THE TERRIBLE IRONY OF THIS

Answer for yourself: Have you ever confused "Messianic prophecy" with "Sun-worship" and the prophecy concerning the coming of sun-g-d redeemers?

Before you say "no" you need to listen to this. These Pythagorean-Greek Jews of Alexandria (the Essenes) had long since separated from conservative Judaism. Study will reveal this to you. Just because Jews lived in Alexandria does not mean they were not Hellenized and had been influenced by the religious climate that existed in [Alexandria, Egypt](#).

These Greek-Jews (Essenes) of Alexandria were the translators of the Jewish Scriptures and were responsible for the Greek translation of the Old Testament which would later find its way into the Christian Bible. In other words, many religious teachings of these Pythagorean-Buddhist Essenes, as taken from Pythagorean and Buddhist religious beliefs, as well as Iranian sun-worship, were "added" into their Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures in order to enhance the religious authority of their sect. This is a fact! They made it look as if God had sanctioned them as "His people" instead of Israel! Besides that they altered what the Tanakh said concerning the "anointed one to come" and patterned the Messiah after sun-g-ds.

These Pythagorean-Buddhist Greek-Jews looked toward a cosmic sun-g-d incarnated man. This man will be "crucified" and killed in the heavens. These concepts were later personified as if this man was real. The stories and legends grew (<http://paganizingfaithofyeshua.netfirms.com>). The irony is that when Jesus was "crucified," this large group of Essene believers, in the turbulent Messianic confusion of the first century, looked to the "crucified Jesus" as the one they had been waiting for, but admittedly missed identifying him as such while he was alive. So, if you followed, these pagan beliefs as held by these Pythagorean-Buddhist Essenes, which originated from sun-worship, the same "pagan religious beliefs" which had been "added" to the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures, were now applied to Jesus after his crucifixion. Jesus became the "fulfillment" of them only because these Essenes identified him after he was crucified with their crucified theological heroes.

So what was never Messianic prophecy in the Greek translation and alteration of the Jewish Scriptures, now becomes "Messianic prophecy" to these Essenes in the first century. Religious concepts held by these Essenes which they applied to their incarnated sun-g-d redeemer Angel-Messiah were now applied to Jesus. These Essenes literally convert as a large group to the Jesus' movement in the first century and almost totally vanish. They become the first Christians. Now within the synagogues in the latter part of the first century and later we have two Messianic beliefs jockeying for mastery: one Davidic, and one Cosmic; one from the Tanakh and one from a synthesis of Pythagorean-Indian-Buddhist belief which trace their origin to astrology and sun-worship and which were recorded in a falsified

translation of the Jewish Scriptures by prior Essenes in Alexandria in order to bolster the authority of their sect by promoting the sect and their religious views as if given by God in the Bible. No wonder the Jews down through history, as well as today, don't accept much what is taught by the Christian church about Jesus and the Messiah; their Bibles never had such stuff in it!

The problem for the Christian is that the Tanakh never said such things about the Davidic Messiah. Many of these concepts as held by these Essenes which were applied by them from the corrupted Greek Old Testament to Jesus, their acclaimed Angel-Messiah, never could be found in the Jewish Tanakh. **Their beliefs about Messiah were not to be found in the Tanakh, but only in their own writings to which they exalted above the writings of Moses and the prophets.**

The same passages that these Essenes yielded to in the Greek Old Testament for their beliefs concerning their g-dman, when examined in the Jewish Scriptures and rightly understood and interpreted by conservative Rabbis, never were intended to be of a Messianic nature in the first place.

Answer for yourself: Do you want to believe the truth about Jesus and the Messiah, or will fantasy and pagan beliefs, long ago added to the Word of God and undetected by most today, suffice for your religious beliefs as far as your concerned?

Tragically, we read these "added" religious doctrines in our Christian Old Testament, and read the "quotes in the New Testament as taken from the same source" as if given by God. We read them as if this were the truth about the Messiah and Jesus. We never had a reason to doubt our Christian Old Testament or its quotes in the New Testament. Just a cursory reading of these documents will not reveal what I have said in this article to hardly anyone. Only serious study and comparative study of the documents will do this. We choose to believe like "good and faithful" Christians and like sheep we were led astray and never knew it. And we never knew, that is up till now! God knows we have believed a lie even if we don't, and I thank Him that is love is not contingent on us being "right." But if we can learn the truth and alter our worship whereby we remove ourselves, based on what we learn, from idolatry, then our love for God should demand we study to find the truth and not die as idolators.

The Christian Old Testaments might read as if came from God, because most of it did, and the New Testament's quotes of these falsified passages might seem reassuring, but if you took the time to compare these problem passages with the Jewish Bibles today you would see for yourself the prophets never said such things as recorded in many places in the Christian Old Testaments. Besides that, the quotes in the New Testament, when taken from these problem passages, are completely wrong and misleading as well.

There exists today the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures and the Christian Old Testament and they are not the same in very important places affecting both doctrines and prophecies. As a Christian you will never know that until someone first tells you and then you go look for yourself to see if this be true. When I was confronted with such information I, as a Pastor, had to know. What if I had been wrong? What if I had the wrong book? What if 2000 years ago things were changed and I don't know it and believe what I have been told and taught by others who don't know as well?

As stated above, but its importance requires its restatement. Many quotes from this altered Christian Old Testament were again included in the New Testament and you read them as if they are again true and given by God. All you are reading are the accepted traditions of those who came before you who either never knew how to read Hebrew, knew of this deception or willfully added to it.

The New English Bible goes on to say:

"In the second century A.D. or even earlier the Rabbis, the Jewish religious leaders, compiled a text from such manuscripts as had survived the destruction of Jerusalem in A.D. 70, and on this basis was established the

traditional or Massoretic text, so called from the Hebrew word "massorah" or "tradition". The earliest surviving manuscripts of this text date from the ninth to eleventh centuries A.D.; and it is this text, as printed in R. Kittel's Biblia Hebraica (3rd edition, 1937), which has been used for the present translation".

Let me tell you what you just read....**Another lie!**

The text in the Oxford's New English Bible, like all Christian Old Testaments, is NOT the text that is used, or has been used, by the Jewish Rabbis and people since long before Jesus! That's right. The text you are reading is the one handed down by the Alexandrian translators which forged many of their sects Pythagorean-Buddhist and Essene doctrines into their translations. You are reading the evolution of their Greek translation and not the Hebrew Masoretic text in all instances. In the majority of the passages we find agreement between the Greek and the Hebrew, and any differences are minor to say the least. Yet, it not these passages that trouble us, but the one which make for theological and doctrinal diversity.

This is the purpose of the Web Site and the many articles listed; to reveal this problem to all those who show interest. On this site I have provided for you what I believe to be overwhelming evidence to not only the falsification and purposeful mistranslation of the Jewish Scriptures, but hundreds of examples of these divergent doctrines and religious beliefs which influenced many in the early years of the early church. Some never deterred from the faith of Jesus; but many did. Many were influenced by this Greek adulteration of the Jewish Bible, and forthcoming were doctrines taken from this Greek text along with variant readings which ended up in your Christian Bibles. We go to church and "hear" these falsehoods taught and "amended" but never take the time to compare. I have don't that for you. The evidence is not pretty, but repentance is. With every lie exposed, with every false doctrine crushed, and with every step toward truth and obedience, then God is closer.

Not only did you not know of these things before now, but those who published this Oxford Bible did not know as well; at least hopefully for it would be a terrible thing to think that such deception was done on purpose. To list all the Christian Bibles which have fallen to this same deceptions would take forever.

THE CHRONOLOGY OF THE CHRISTIAN'S OLD TESTAMENT TEXT

"What about the Hebrew text used by the KJV translators? Here is some background on it. The Daniel Bomberg edition, 1516-17, was called the "First Rabbinic Bible." That's a joke. This text, in many places, was derived from the Septuagint instead of the Palestinian Masoretic text, which I will show you in the following pages on this web site, is but an altered and poorly constructed falsification of the Jewish Scriptures in many places. Again, I must be fair. Much confirms the Jewish Masoretic text, but there are instances where it does not and these are theological and doctrinal problems for the Christian if he only knew.

Then in 1524-25, Bomberg published a second edition edited by Abraham Ben Chayyim (or Ben Hayyim) iben Adonijah. This is called the Ben Chayyim edition of the Hebrew text. Daniel Bomberg's edition, on which the KJV is based, was the Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text. This was called the Second Great Rabbinic Bible. This became the standard Masoretic text for the next 400 years. All along you need to understand this is a fraudulent text and now the people, uneducated, never knew. Sounds a lot like today. They accepted what they had been handed just like you and me. Bomberg never knew himself for the adulteration of the Jewish Scriptures into Greek was clouded in embellished legends (the letter of Aristeas) which had grown around the importance and divine creation of the Greek translation which scholars today recognize as lies told to increase the importance and acceptance of this falsified text by the Gentiles as against the Jewish Bible. You need to realize when one begins with a misrepresented text, and when quotes are taken from these falsified, perverted, twisted, and adulterated passages, then the quotes are just a wrong as its parent document!

"The Ben Chayyim Masoretic Text was used even in the first two editions of Biblia Hebraica by Rudolf Kittel.

The dates on those first two editions were 1906 and 1912. He used the same Hebrew text as the KJV translators (it is already corrupted). Now the KJV has this same falsified and corrupted Old Testament as the Septuagint and few know today; except the Rabbis who both know and read Hebrew.

Answer for yourself: Have you ever wondered why the Rabbis don't use the Christian Bible's Old Testament? Could it be that they know it is theologically mutant in many places? Why not use it if it is accurate?

SO WHY HAS CHRISTIANS REJECTED THE JEWISH BIBLE JESUS USED? IS "OLDEST" REALLY THE "BEST"?

Today, the reason that most of the Hebrew departments, in colleges, universities, and seminaries who teach Hebrew, use Septuagint and Christian Old Testaments instead of the Palestinian Masoretic text is the same reason they use the critical Greek text in the N.T. They believe the "oldest" texts, either in Hebrew or in Greek, must always be the best. **Not necessarily.** Since no copies of the Masoretic text could be found till the 9th century A.D. these "differences" of what I spoke were assumed to be nothing more than a Jewish reaction to Christianity. Christian writers and scholars of their day assumed that the variant readings were because the Jewish Rabbis removed the "prophecies" in reaction to Christianity and Jesus. Without sufficient knowledge and on the surface this makes all the sense. We have two Old Testaments. One is made to be a constant prophecy about the Messiah or Jesus. The other is not. The Greek manuscripts of the Jewish Hebrew Scriptures were older than any existing Jewish Masoretic texts by a thousand years, and following the rule "oldest is best" preference was given by most to the Greek translation over the Hebrew Masoretic text. Not all agreed however. I find it rather startling that Clement of Rome, the first Bishop of Rome, referenced in all his writings the Jewish Masoretic Palestinian text and never quoted from the Greek. Check me out and see if I am right. The first Church father beyond Paul did not use the Greek Scriptures and he was the Bishop of Rome.

Answer for yourself: What did he know that we don't? Could he possibly have known that the Greek translation had been perverted and misrepresented the Messiah so badly that he could not use it?

So, logically following the "oldest is best" rule the Christians paid little attention the the Jewish Bible and their Jewish texts which were definitely "not Christianized (in the form of promotion of the Essene Angel-Messiah)." What you need to understand is that even though these Greek translations might be the oldest, they were doctored by Essene heretics and therefore are not the "best" regardless that they are the oldest. **Oldest never means most accurate or truthful.**

Answer for yourself: But how can we know for sure? How can we know the Rabbis' Old Testaments today are true and the Christian Old Testament falsified? Until the last 50 years it has been one camp vs the other camp; opinion vs opinion. Nothing was settled.

THE ROCKS CRY OUT

Then God did something wonderful.

With the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls came evidence to the existence of this Jewish Masoretic text just as old or older than the Septuagint (Greek translations of the Old Testament). The identical similarity of a texts separated by over a thousand years was infinitesimal. The accuracy was astonishing and almost beyond belief. No longer could Christians say the Jews changed their Old Testaments after Jesus as a sour-grapes reaction to Christianity! Since the discovery of the manuscripts at Qumran we now have copies of the same texts reading identical which are separated by more than one thousand years. This exactness in the comparison of the 900 A.D. texts with the 200 B.C.E. texts has convinced textual scholars, both Jews and Christians, that such uniformness can be applied safely to all of the Masoretic texts. It must not be forgotten that we now have in our possession Masoretic texts as old or order than the Septuagint which contradict and correct the deviant readings which were added to the Greek mistranslation of the Hebrew texts by the Alexandrian Greek-Jews and

Essenes. We now know the Septuagint is the errant text and one needs to begin to examine the origin of this translation in order to come to an understanding who it was that was behind the translation, and the existing religious beliefs of the sect that translated it, and their reasons for doing so.

The discovery at Qumran revealed that the Masoretic text we have today as preserved and used by Rabbis all over the world, is the same Masoretic text unaltered for the most part that existed long before the time of Jesus. **It is this Masoretic text which should have been used in all readings of the Christian's Old Testament and it was not!** And again let us not forget that this Jewish Masoretic text, as found at Qumran, differs considerably with the Greek translations found there also. If this more accurate Masoretic text had been used for the Christian's Old Testament instead of the corrupted Essene one, then the lies told about Jesus in the New Testament would not have existed, or at least been promulgated as if were Divine fiat.

What should concern you now is whether you want to read the real Word of God before you die or not. What should concern you is that you have a choice before you: you can obtain an "accurate" translation of the Jewish Scriptures in English by accepting the Jewish Tanakh, or you can continue to read your contemporary Christian Old Testament and its fables concerning a g-dman Angel-Messiah. A "translation" is what you were expecting when you bought your Christian Bible; you got a purposeful mistranslation in many places, and not possessing the knowledge, you are forced to read it not discerning the meat from the bones.

Answer for yourself: Don't you want a faithful translation? If it could be proven to you that the Greek translation was falsified over two thousand years ago would you not want to know? If it could be shown that those who did this translation were not the Rabbis as attested by legend as you have been told... would you want to know? Do you want to get behind the legends and get the facts and the truth?

DID JESUS LEAVE US ANY CLUES?

Not only was the Jewish Scripture preserved by the Jews in Palestine, but it was authorized by Jesus. Understand that in Jesus' day the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures existed and had for almost two hundred years. It can be shown that Jesus authorized the traditional Masoretic Hebrew O.T. text and not the Greek translation of these Jewish Scriptures:

Matt 4:4

4 But he answered and said, It is written, Man shall not live by bread alone, but by every word that proceedeth out of the mouth of God.

Matt 5:17-18

17 Think not that I am come to destroy the law, or the prophets: I am not come to destroy, but to fulfill.

18 For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled (referencing the Hebrew text and not the Greek).

Luke 24:44

44 And he said unto them, These are the words which I spake unto you, while I was yet with you, that all things must be fulfilled, which were written in the law of Moses, and in the prophets, and in the psalms, concerning me.

Jesus never refuted any text, any word, or any letter in the Hebrew O.T. He didn't say, "Now Moses was misquoted here, it should have been this..." Jesus never said: "We need to get the Greek translation because the Messianic prophecies in the Hebrew have been altered and I have been taken out of them." He never said: "The doctrines as taught in the Hebrew texts have passed away and the newer ones in the Greek is what God really intended to say." **THINK!**

He offered no textual criticism whatever. Had there been any changes, I'm sure he would have at least mentioned it somewhere in his teaching and preaching or at least corrected it if it had been in error. If he had then we would have some record of it, but in all that is recorded of his life and his sayings there is not one instance of him ever correcting "the text" or telling us that the existing Greek translation is the true Word of God and should be heeded over the Palestinian Masoretic text. Jesus was quick to correct sin and error in behavior of the people, and the source for his authority and truth which was the standard for all mankind's conduct was the Hebrew texts. It would seem that if such beliefs and dogmas in the Hebrew Masoretic text had been wrong and different ones and changes in the Greek translation had been right, then Jesus would have been a hypocrite to teach from and correct others from a Hebrew Masoretic text which was not authoritative or Divine. Jesus, if from God, would have been obligated to teach from the new improved Greek Bible. He did not!

Jesus never alluded to the Greek Bible once, but always referred to the Jewish Masoretic text as it existed in his day! Understand the Greek texts and translation of the Jewish Scriptures existed in his day and this Greek Bible had 4 divisions and not 3 like the Jewish Bible. Again, he tells us in Luke 24:44 that it is the: 1) Law of Moses, 2) prophets, and 3) psalms where all is to be fulfilled. (3 divisions and not 4). Jesus alludes directly to the Jewish Bible and not the Greek Bible.

Answer for yourself: Don't you think Jesus knew of the alterations and corruptions of the Greek translation and could this be the reason both he and the Jewish religious leaders in Palestine refused to use it?

Jesus' stamp of approval is on the Masoretic Hebrew text, and yours needs to be as well.

Shalom.



20% off on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



DID THE RABBIS TRANSLATE ONLY THE FIRST 5 BOOKS OF THE OLD TESTAMENT?

As legends would have it the Jews are credited with translating the Jewish Scriptures in the Greek; thus giving the world the Greek Old Testament. In reality, this is just not so. Only when one come to the correct understanding of history and the origin of the LXX can one explain why this Greek OT deviates in hundreds of places from the Masoretic Hebrew Text. Often men will say that the LXX is a faithful translation of the Jewish Masoretic Text, but personal research into the true history will reveal to the serious student the fallacy of such false traditions. This explains the hundreds of purposeful misquotations and mistranslations that litter the pages of the LXX. The problem is no one knows, unless he compares line upon line and precept upon precept with the Jewish Tanakh. Such research will reveal to you how, among other things how “young woman” becomes “virgin” in Isaiah. I have done such homework. Have you? So let us study Josephus and see what he has to say on the matter of the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into the Greek.

THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE JEWS...PREFACE

1. **THOSE** who undertake to write histories, do not, I perceive, take that trouble on one and the same account, but for many reasons, and those such as are very different one from another. For some of them apply themselves to this part of learning to show their skill in composition, and that they may therein acquire a reputation for speaking finely: others of them there are, who write histories in order to gratify those that happen to be concerned in them, and on that account have spared no pains, but rather gone beyond their own abilities in the performance: but others there are, who, of necessity and by force, are driven to write history, because they are concerned in the facts, and so cannot excuse themselves from committing them to writing, for the advantage of posterity; nay, there are not a few who are induced to draw their historical facts out of darkness into light, and to produce them for the benefit of the public, on account of the great importance of the facts themselves with which they have been concerned. Now of these several reasons for writing history, I must profess the two last were my own reasons also; for since I was myself interested in that war which we Jews had with the Romans, and knew myself its particular actions, and what conclusion it had, I was forced to give the history of it, because I saw that others perverted the truth of those actions in their writings.
2. Now I have undertaken the present work, as thinking it will appear to all the Greeks (2) worthy of their study; for it will contain all our antiquities, and the constitution of our government, as interpreted out of the Hebrew Scriptures. And indeed I did formerly intend, when I wrote of the war, (3) to explain who the Jews originally were, - what fortunes they had been subject to, - and by what legislature they had been instructed in piety, and the exercise of other virtues, - what wars also they had made in remote ages, till they were unwillingly engaged in this last with the Romans: but because this work would take up a great compass, I separated it into a set treatise by itself, with a beginning of its own, and its own conclusion; but in process of time, as usually happens to such as undertake great things, I grew weary and went on slowly, it being a large subject, and a difficult thing to translate our history into a foreign, and to us unaccustomed language. However, some persons there were who desired to know our history, and so exhorted me to go on with it; and, above all the rest, Epaphroditus, (4) a man who is a lover of all kind of

learning, but is principally delighted with the knowledge of history, and this on account of his having been himself concerned in great affairs, and many turns of fortune, and having shown a wonderful rigor of an excellent nature, and an immovable virtuous resolution in them all. I yielded to this man's persuasions, who always excites such as have abilities in what is useful and acceptable, to join their endeavors with his. I was also ashamed myself to permit any laziness of disposition to have a greater influence upon me, than the delight of taking pains in such studies as were very useful: I thereupon stirred up myself, and went on with my work more cheerfully. Besides the foregoing motives, I had others which I greatly reflected on; and these were, that our forefathers were willing to communicate such things to others; and that some of the Greeks took considerable pains to know the affairs of our nation.

3. I found, therefore, that the second of the Ptolemies was a king who was extraordinarily diligent in what concerned learning, and the collection of books; that he was also peculiarly ambitious to procure a translation of our law, and of the constitution of our government therein contained, into the Greek tongue. Now Eleazar the high priest, one not inferior to any other of that dignity among us, did not envy the forenamed king the participation of that advantage, which otherwise he would for certain have denied him, but that he knew the custom of our nation was, to hinder nothing of what we esteemed ourselves from being communicated to others. Accordingly, I thought it became me both to imitate the generosity of our high priest, and to suppose there might even now be many lovers of learning like the king; for he did not obtain all our writings at that time; **but those who were sent to Alexandria as interpreters, gave him only the books of the law,** while there were a vast number of other matters in our sacred books. They, indeed, contain in them the history of five thousand years; in which time happened many strange accidents, many chances of war, and great actions of the commanders, and mutations of the form of our government. Upon the whole, a man that will peruse this history, may principally learn from it, that all events succeed well, even to an incredible degree, and the reward of felicity is proposed by God; but then it is to those that follow his will, and do not venture to break his excellent laws: and that so far as men any way apostatize from the accurate observation of them, what was practical before becomes impracticable (5) and whatsoever they set about as a good thing, is converted into an incurable calamity. And now I exhort all those that peruse these books, to apply their minds to God; and to examine the mind of our legislator, whether he hath not understood his nature in a manner worthy of him; and hath not ever ascribed to him such operations as become his power, and hath not preserved his writings from those indecent fables which others have framed, although, by the great distance of time when he lived, he might have securely forged such lies; for he lived two thousand years ago; at which vast distance of ages the poets themselves have not been so hardy as to fix even the generations of their gods, much less the actions of their men, or their own laws. As I proceed, therefore, I shall accurately describe what is contained in our records, in the order of time that belongs to them; for I have already promised so to do throughout this undertaking; and this without adding any thing to what is therein contained, or taking away any thing therefrom.

4. But because almost all our constitution depends on the wisdom of Moses, our legislator, I cannot avoid saying somewhat concerning him beforehand, though I shall do it briefly; I mean, because otherwise those that read my book may wonder how it comes to pass, that my discourse, which promises an account of laws and historical facts, contains so much of philosophy. The reader is therefore to know, that Moses deemed it exceeding necessary, that he who would conduct his own life well, and give laws to others, in the first place should consider the Divine nature; and, upon the contemplation of God's operations, should thereby imitate the best of all patterns, so far as it is possible for human nature to do, and to endeavor to follow after it: neither could the legislator himself have a right mind without such a contemplation; nor would any thing he should write tend to the promotion of virtue in his readers; I mean, unless they be taught first of all, that God is the Father and Lord of all things, and sees all things, and that thence he bestows a happy life upon those that follow him; but plunges such as do not walk in the paths of virtue into inevitable miseries. Now when Moses was desirous to teach this lesson to his countrymen, he did not begin the establishment of his laws after the same manner that other legislators did; I mean, upon contracts and other rights between one man and another, but by raising their minds upwards to regard God, and his creation of the world; and by persuading them, that we men are the most excellent of the creatures of God upon earth. Now when once he had brought them to submit to religion, he easily persuaded them to submit in all other things: for as to other legislators, they followed fables, and by

their discourses transferred the most reproachful of human vices unto the gods, and afforded wicked men the most plausible excuses for their crimes; but as for our legislator, when he had once demonstrated that God was possessed of perfect virtue, he supposed that men also ought to strive after the participation of it; and on those who did not so think, and so believe, he inflicted the severest punishments. I exhort, therefore, my readers to examine this whole undertaking in that view; for thereby it will appear to them, that there is nothing therein disagreeable either to the majesty of God, or to his love to mankind; for all things have here a reference to the nature of the universe; while our legislator speaks some things wisely, but enigmatically, and others under a decent allegory, but still explains such things as required a direct explication plainly and expressly. However, those that have a mind to know the reasons of every thing, may find here a very curious philosophical theory, which I now indeed shall wave the explication of; but if God afford me time for it, I will set about writing it (6) after I have finished the present work. I shall now betake myself to the history before me, after I have first mentioned what Moses says of the creation of the world, which I find described in the sacred books after the manner following.

SO WHY SHOULD THIS MATTER TO THE CHRISTIAN?

First of all you should desire as truthful translation of the Jewish Scriptures Yeshua used as possible. For over 200 years the Greek translation had been in existence and falsely translated by the Greek-Jews of Alexandria for theological purposes who patterned YHVH's Messianic predictions after their pagan g-ds. Such is the fruit of Hellenization on the Jews. In many places the Word of YHVH has been altered to make the Messiah conform to the pattern of mystery religions. As it that was not enough, when one's religious belief system includes a belief about Yeshua, then understand prophecies altered in the LXX would mistakenly be applied to him which have little relevance to his historical existence. False beliefs are attached to Yeshua let alone the Jewish Messiah. Many of these beliefs, all stemming from a fraudulent translation, are in the Words of the Jewish Scriptures considered sin by YHVH. And if that is not enough, this falsified Greek translation, in which the Jewish Rabbis only translated the first 5 books, has become the substrate for all Greek New Testaments which follow. If the Greek NT is based off a fraudulent translation of the Palestinian Masoretic text in hundreds of places because of the theological agendas of these Greek-Jewish Pythagorean-Buddhists of Alexandria, Egypt, in the first two centuries B.C.E. as well as the further corruptions by the monks during the Church age, then understand the Christian Bibles we have are false as well in these places. The quest for you is to divide the truth from the chaff. Such is an absolute impossibility without years of intense study in manuscript evidences. I have devoted much of my life to such a purpose and share these findings with you in hopes you, the reader, will understand that such alterations pass off today as truth and the sad fact of the reality of the matter is that G-d never gave it and Yeshua never believed it. Thus when alluding to the Scriptures in his day, Yeshua on two occasions mentions that the Palestinian text, and not the LXX, refers to him. Without a doubt Yeshua knew of the problems with the Greek translation in his day. So did the Rabbis.

Answer for yourself: Do You? And does it matter to you? The bottom line in all of this dear one, is that unless you have the Palestinian text, you have never read the unadulterated Word of G-d yet in you life. You have accepted in total faith a religious propagandist document full of hundreds of mistranslations, misquotations, and verses lifted out of context which has almost destroyed the true revelation of the Messiah given to Israel. If this touches your heart let us hear from you as we can help you better worship the Father in Spirit and in Truth and not through corrupted pagan texts mixed with some truth as found in your Christian Bibles. Shalom.



THE "SEPTUAGINT"...THE GREEK TRANSLATION OF THE HEBREW SCRIPTURES

Answer for yourself: How do you give authority to a new book that is in competition with a prior "best seller?"

Well that is simply, you build up big legends about this "new book" and spread them to the populace. In time your "new book," if merchandised correctly, will outsell your competition. This was done with the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures.

THE LETTER OF ARISTEAS

Forged tales were fabricated to account for the translation into Greek of the Jewish Scriptures, in what is known as the Septuagint Version. After the conquests by Alexander the Great and his establishment of the city of Alexandria in Egypt, immense numbers of Jews were settled in the new city, which quickly became the commercial and intellectual center of the ancient world, with Greek the universal language. The holy Hebrew language had become a dead language to the Jews of the "Dispersion"; their synagogue services could not be conducted in the mother tongue. The Alexandrian Jews, the vast majority who had been influenced by Hellenism and the Greek religious culture, were accordingly under necessity to render the "Law" into Greek for their public use; and this was gradually done by such of them as thought themselves able to do such work. These Greek-Jewish Essenes of Alexandria would take it upon themselves to translation the Jewish Scriptures into Greek as well as add many of their sect's doctrines and dogmas among its pages. But this common-place mode of rendering the sacred Hebrew into a Gentile speech did not satisfy the pious wonder-craving Jewish mind. Accordingly, somewhere about 200 B.C., an anonymous Jew invented a more satisfactory tale, which has had incalculable influence on the Christian faith and dogmas. This pious Israelite had the customary recourse to religions forgery; he forged a letter in the name of one Aristeas, an official of Ptolemy II, Philadelphus, the Greek king of Egypt, 285-247 B.C., purporting to be addressed to his brother, Philocrates, and giving a marvelous history of the Translation.

Here, in substance, is what we read of the first origin of the Version, limited therein to the "law" of Moses, as first related by Josephus. What we need to do is stop and think right now: at this time at the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into Greek the Jews recognized as their "Bible" ONLY the first five books of Moses. This is important because the legend will make it sound as if the Rabbis translated the whole of the Law, the Prophets, and the Writings. Their failure to do so explains the hundreds of corruptions and adulterations made to the text as it was translated into Greek by these Greek-Jews of Alexandria later. Ptolemy had recently established a library at Alexandria, which he purposed should contain a copy of every obtainable literary work extant. This Library became the most extensive and celebrated of the ancient world, containing some 700,000 manuscript books at the time it was savagely destroyed, in 391 A.D., by the benighted Christian zeal and fury of Bishop Theophilus of Alexandria and his crazy monks of Nitria, as related in Kingsley's Hypatia or any history of the times. CE. xiv, 625.) At the suggestion of Demetrius, his Librarian, fables the pseudo-Aristeas through Josephus, that he should enrich the Library with a copy of the sacred law (notice again it was the first 5 books of the Law only) of the Jews Ptolemy wrote

to Eleazar the chief priest at Jerusalem, sending the letter and magnificent presents "to God" by the hand of a delegation including Aristes, requesting a copy of the Law and a number of learned Jews competent to translate it into Greek. The embassy was successful; a richly ornamented **copy of the holy law**, written in letters of gold, was sent to the King, together with seventy-two Doctors of Israel, deputed to deliver the Book and to carry out the wishes of the King. They were received with great honor, says pseudo-Aristes, and duly feted for several days; they were then conducted across the long causeway to the Island of Pharos to the place which was prepared for them, "which was a house that was built near the shore, and was a quiet place, and fit for their discoursing together about their work, ... Accordingly they made an accurate interpretation, with great zeal and great pains," working until the ninth hour each day, and visiting Ptolemy every morning. "Now when the **Law was transcribed [first 5 books only]**, and the labor of interpretation was over, which came to its conclusion in seventy-two days," the work was read over to the assembled Jews, who rejoiced that "the interpretation was happily finished"; they were enjoined to report any errors or emissions which they might discover, to the "Seventy," who would make the necessary corrections in their work. (Josephus, *Antiq. Jews*, Bk. XII, chap. 2; CE. xiii, 722.) **Thus the translation was only of "The Law," the Five Books of Moses;** and it was open team-work, all the Seventy-two working together, comparing and discussing as they proceeded, and expressly enjoining the Jews to note and report for correction all errors of omission or commission which they might discover.

NECESSARY CORRECTIONS? WHAT'S UP?

Thus the pseudo-Aristes, as cited by Josephus; thought, as a matter of fact, **this Septuagint Version, so-called because of the legendary Seventy-(two), was in the grossest manner inaccurate, and imported innumerable errors into the Christian religion which was based upon and propagated for several centuries only through the Septuagint texts. Indeed, "the text of the Septuagint was regarded as so unreliable, because of its freedom in rendering, and of the alterations which had been introduced into it, etc., that, during the second century of our era it was discarded by the Church."** (*Catholic Encyclopedia*. iv, 625.) We shall notice the fearful error of Isaiah's "virgin-birth" text; for other well-known instances, it makes out Creation 1195 years earlier than the Hebrew and Vulgate, 4004 B.C., and the venerable Methuselah is made to survive the Flood by fourteen years. **Despite, however, its patently legendary character, the pseudo-Aristes' account, the forged letter and the story, were eagerly accepted as genuine and authentic by Fathers, These Greek early Church Fathers, believing the legend, fell prey to the errors in the Greek text. Coupled with that and their inability to read Hebrew whereby such "purposeful mistranslations" could be easily spotted, they like most of us, fell prey to relying on a text full of error of which they never knew since adopting and believing in simple faith that this Greek translation was accurate and was the "Bible from God!"** Popes and ecclesiastic writers until the sixteenth century, when their spurious character was revealed by the nascent modern criticism. "The authenticity of the letter, called in question first by Louis Vives (1492-1540), professor at Louvain, is now universally denied." (CE. xiii, 722.)

FURTHER EMBELLISHING OF THE LXX LEGEND...THE CREATIVITY OF THE CHURCH FATHERS

The Fathers, however, could not rest content with this unvarnished original fabrication in the name of Aristes, of an ordinary human and errant translation of the "Law"; they avidly set about embellishing it in the accepted clerical style, adding fanciful and lying details to emphasize the miraculous and inspired origin of the Version. These actions guaranteed the success of the LXX over the Palestinian Masoretic text. **What I find amazing is that Clement of Rome, the Bishop of Rome, the first major Christian writer after Paul, used only the Jewish Palestinian text for "all" his quotations of Scripture in his writings. It is not as if he did not know Greek, for being the Bishop of Rome dictated such, but yet, he quoted only from the Jewish Scriptures and not the Greek translation.**

Answer for yourself: Did he know something we don't, are as yet just coming to the knowledge of?

As this notable instance of belief in legends serves admirably to illustrate the childish and uncritical credulity of the Fathers, their reckless disregard of truth, their chronic zest for any untruth or fable quotable to pander to the glory of God and enhance the pious superstition of the Faithful, let us here watch the growth of this simple human yarn of the Jewish Aristeas-forger into the wonderful and ever more embellished miracle as it passes from Father to Father, -- exactly as the Gospel-fables grew from "Mark" to "John." According to Fathers Tertullian, St. Augustine, St. Jerome, et als., the 72 were inspired by God each severally for the entire work; in translating they did not consult with one another; they had been shut up incommunicados in separate cells on Pharos, either singly or in pairs, and their several translations, when finished and compared, were found to agree entirely both as to sense and the expressions employed, with the original Hebrew text and with each other (St. Clement of Alexandria, St. Irenaeus, Justin Martyr). Finally, the 72 translated not only the Law, but the entire Old Testament, -- **several of whose Books were not yet at the time written. Again this betrays the lack of truth and honesty as found in the early Church Fathers and yet we are to believe them and untold is the influence they had upon what we call Christianity today!**

WHY CAN'T JUSTIN MARTYR GET THE FACTS RIGHT THE SECOND TIME?

Father Justin Martyr adds near-eye-witness verification to the false and already embroidered history, saying that the "Seventy" were, by order of the King, (Ptolemy)" shut up in as many separate cells, and were obliged by him, each to translate the whole Bible apart, and without any communication with each other, yet all their several translations were found to agree verbatim from the beginning to the end, and were by that means demonstrated to be of divine inspiration"; and he adds, for confirmation of faith! -- like Paul, protesting he is not lying in anticipation of the accusation: "These things, ye men of Greece, are no fable, nor do we narrate fictions; but we ourselves having been in Alexandria, saw the remains of the little [cells] at the Pharos still preserved." (Ad Graec. ch. xiii; ANF. i, 278-9.)

But in repeating the tale to the Roman Emperor, Father Justin makes the unhappy blunder of saying, that Ptolemy "sent to **Herod**, who was at that time king of the Jews, requesting that the books of the prophets [pseudo-Aristeas said the "Law"] be sent to him; and the king did indeed send them" (I Apol. ch. xxxi; ANF. i, 173).

Answer for yourself: Did you catch his lie?

Herod lived some 300 years after Ptolemy died. **This forged fable is time and again repeated as sober truth.**

Bishop Saint Irenaeus emphasizes the **miraculous nature of the translation of all the Books**, saying that when the 72 identical translations were compared, "God was indeed glorified, and the Scriptures were acknowledged an truly divine; ... even the Gentiles present perceived that the Scriptures had been interpreted by the inspiration of God. And there was nothing astonishing in God having done this. ... He inspired Esdras the priest (after the return from captivity) to recast all the words of the former prophets, and to reestablish with the people of God the Mosaic legislation." (Adv. Haer. III, xxi, 2; ANF. i, 451-2.) **By now you should be seeing little miraculous was connected with them.**

THE TRANSLATION OF THE REST OF THE JEWISH SCRIPTURES

In the course of a century or two before the Christian Era, the other Hebrew sacred books were likewise translated into Greek for the use of the Greek-speaking Jews of "the Dispersion," together with numbers of the forged Jewish apocrypha, and all these were added to the rolls of "Scriptures." **This final and adulterated form of the Septuagint "was the vehicle which conveyed these additional Scriptures [i.e. the apocryphal Tobias, etc.] into the Catholic Church."** (CE. iii, 271.)

The role of the Holy Ghost in certifying the ill-translated and tempered Septuagint for the foundations of Christian Faith, was very disastrous, as CE. Points out:

"The Church had adopted the Septuagint as its own; this differed from the Hebrew not only by the addition of several books and passages but also by innumerable variations of text, due partly to the ordinary process of corruption in the transcription of ancient books, partly to the culpable temerity, as Origen called it, of correctors who used not a little freedom in making 'corrections,' additions, and suppressions, partly to mistakes in translation, and finally in great part to the fact that the original Septuagint had been made from a Hebrew text quite different from that fixed at Jamnia as the one standard by the Jewish Rabbis." (CE. vii, 316.)

So YHVH only knows what he actually said and did in the 4004 years up to the time of the birth of Jesus.

BUT THE WORST IS YET TO COME...IF THAT IS POSSIBLE

Matters grew worse as time progressed: the ex-Pagan Greek Fathers who founded Christianity, propagated the new Faith for several centuries only from the tortuous texts of this falsified Septuagint, which was the only Old Testament "Scriptures" known to and used by them as the source of the "prophecies fulfilled by Jesus Christ" and the holy mysteries of the Jewish-Christian Faith. "Copies of the Septuagint," says CE., "were multiplied, and, as might be expected, many changes, deliberate as well as involuntary, crept in." (CE. xiii, 723.) Indeed, the itch for Scripture-scribbling was so rife among such ex-Pagan Christians as could write and get hold of a copy, that St. Augustine complains: "It is possible to enumerate those who have translated the Scriptures from Hebrew into Greek, but not those who have translated them into Latin. In sooth, in the curly days of the faith whoso possessed a Greek manuscript and thought he had some knowledge of both tongues was daring enough to undertake a translation." (De Doct. Christ. II, xi; CE. ix, 20.) So the Faith was founded on befuddlement of the Blessed Word of God as any nondescript scribbler palmed it off to be.

The Holy Church never possessed or used a single book of "Scripture" or other document of importance, to the glory of God and the glorification of the Church, which was not a rank original forgery and bristled besides with "many deliberate changes" or forged interpolations.



20% off on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: NF20



THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE

THE TESTIMONY OF THE CATHOLIC ENCYCLOPEDIA CONCERNING THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS OF THE BIBLE

THE PRE-MASSORETIC TEXT

The earliest Hebrew manuscript is the Nash papyrus. There are four fragments, which, when pieced together, give twenty-four lines of a pre-Massoretic text of the Ten Commandments and the shema (Ex., xx, 2-17; Deut., v, 6-19; vi, 4-5). The writing is without vowels and seems paleographically to be not later than the second century. This is the oldest extant Bible manuscript (see Cook, "A Pre-Massoretic Biblical Papyrus" in "Proceed. of the Soc. of Bib. Arch.", Jan., 1903). It agrees at times with the Septuagint against the Massorah. Another pre-Massoretic text is the Samaritan Pentateuch. The Samaritan recension is probably pre-exilic; it has come down to us free from Massoretic influences, is written without vowels and in Samaritan characters. The earliest Samaritan manuscript extant is that of Nablûs, which was formerly rated very much earlier than all Massoretic manuscripts, but is now assigned to the twelfth or thirteenth century A.D. Here mention should be made of the non-Massoretic Hebrew manuscripts of the Book of Ecclesiasticus (q.v.). These fragments, obtained from a Cairo genizah (a box for worn-out or cast-off manuscripts), belong to the tenth or eleventh century of our ear. They provide us with more than a half of Ecclesiasticus and duplicate certain portions of the book. Many scholars deem that the Cairo fragments prove Hebrew to have been the original language of Ecclesiasticus (see "Facsimiles of the Fragments hitherto recovered of the Book of Ecclesiasticus in Hebrew", Oxford and Cambridge, 1901).

THE MASSORETIC TEXT

All other Hebrew manuscripts of the Bible are Massoretic, and belong to the tenth century or later. Probably the earliest Massoretic manuscripts are: "Prophetarium Posteriorum Codex Bablyonicus Petropolitanus", dated A.D. 916; the St. Petersburg Bible, written by Samuel ben Jacob and dated A.D. 1009; and "Codex Oriental. 4445" in the British Museum, which Ginsburg (Introduction, p. 469) assigns to A.D. 820-50. The text critics differ very widely in the dates they assign to certain Hebrew manuscripts. De Rossi is included to think that at most nine or ten Massoretic manuscripts are earlier than the twelfth century (Variæ Lectiones, I, p. xv).

The critical study of this rich assortment of about 3400 Massoretic rolls and codices is not so promising of important results as it would at first thought seem to be. The manuscripts are all of quite recent date, if compared with Greek, Latin, and Syriac codices. They are all singularly alike. Some few variants are found in copies made for private use; copies made for public service in the synagogues are so uniform as to deter the critic from comparing them. All Massoretic manuscripts bring us back to one editor -- that of a textual tradition which probably began in the second century and became more and more minute until every jot and tittle of the text was almost absolutely fixed and sacred. R. Akiba seems to have been the head of this Jewish school of the second century. Unprecedented means were taken to keep the text fixed. The scholars counted the words and consonants of each book, the middle word and middle consonants, the

peculiarities of script, etc. Even when such peculiarities were clearly due to error or to accident, they were perpetuated and interpreted by a mystical meaning. Broken and inverted letters, consonants that were too small or too large, dots which were out of place -- all these oddities were handed down as God-intended. This lack of variants in Massoretic manuscripts leaves us hopeless of reaching back to the original Hebrew text save through the versions. Kittel in his splendid Hebrew text gives such variants as the versions suggest.



THE TRUTH ABOUT WHAT WAS FOUND AT QUMRAN

There sure is a lot of talk about the Dead Sea Scrolls and what was discovered at Qumran. Sadly few know of what they are speaking of as rumor has again replaced solid facts and easily discernible evidence. The debate today, among those pseudo-scholars who have read at least one book on the subject, rages between which texts of the Bible found at Qumran are "authoritative." Many, too many, reply upon the Greek translation of the Jewish Bible for their Old Testaments today, and that for several reasons. First of all, this Greek translation was the translation used by the Greek-speaking church and later it would be the ultimate source and standard for all English translations since the beginning. Coupled with this was the discovery of portions of the Greek translations of the Jewish Scriptures at Qumran. With the failure of the church to read and understand Hebrew the Jewish Hebrews texts, along with the loss of the Hebrew language among the Hellenized Jews of the Second Temple period, even in the days of Jesus, Aramaic had replaced the use of Hebrew among all but the intellectuals and spiritual leadership. Needless to say the ability to read Hebrew fell into disuse long, long ago, and few early Church Fathers could handle the language. Therefore, for them their Bible had to be Greek.

This Greek Septuagint translation of the Torah was done between 285 and 244 B.C.E., as my quote from the *Judaica* below attests to. Further more, the other books of the Tanach were translated during the following 2 centuries, i.e. between 244 and 44 B.C.E.

"Septuagint, the oldest Greek translation of the Bible...the legend contained in the apocryphal letter of Aristeas, according to which 72 elders of Israel, six from each tribe, translated the LAW [Torah] into Greek in Alexandria, during the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphus (285-244 B.C.E.)...The designation Septuagint was **EXTENDED** to the rest of the Bible and non-canonical books that were translated to Greek during the following two centuries" (*Encyclopaedia Judaica*, Volume 14, p1178).

As stated above Biblical manuscripts were recovered in the Qumran excavations; some were Greek, some Aramaic, and some Hebrew. What escapes almost all today, even some scholars it seems, is that the Essenic community possessed conflicting "Bibles." In other words, the Greek read often exactly opposite to what the Hebrew would read.

Answer for yourself: How can this be and yet be the Word of God?

Without serious investigation on your part you most likely never knew this fact in the first place. Besides that, most today, if they know anything at all, have failed to be told about these alarming inconsistencies in the Biblical texts recovered there. There seems to be a general acceptance that the Greek manuscripts found there only solidify the authority already accepted for the Septuagint (the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures).

Let me say that the facts state otherwise along with some scholars who will attest to such. Let us examine just what was found there and see if the manuscripts discovered there confirm the authority of the Greek Bible over the Hebrew Old Testament.

THE FACTS DON'T LIE.....SO WHAT ARE THEY?

The Biblical manuscripts found in the Qumran, are distributed as follows: 60% Proto-Masoretic texts, 20% Qumran style manuscripts, 10% Nonaligned texts, 5% Proto-Samaritan texts, and 5% Septuagintal type texts.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice only 5 % of all the manuscripts found there were Greek? That means the vast majority of the texts were in Hebrew or Aramaic. So much for the fact that the Essenes accepted the authority of the Greek Old Testament and its variant readings over the Palestinian Massoretic text.

Further more, the Qumran style manuscripts have their bases in the proto-Masoretic texts. The Masoretic type texts were dominant in the time of the Hasmonean period (about 160 B.C.E.). (p172 of Reclaiming the Dead Sea Scrolls by Shiffman)

Furthermore, most of the text that vary from the Masoretic (4 LXX manuscript fragments, for example, dating to the 1st and second century B.C.E.), come from cave 4. This is the cave where the texts were not preserved carefully in jars. It is conjectured, that cave 4 was a geniza for the depositing of texts that were damaged or had textual errors.

Some say, 'Cave 4 is close to to Qumran, and had shelves, so it must have been where they kept the books they were currently using.' I disagree. The geniza of Cairo shows that flawed texts, text no longer usable or never usable, that contained the Name of God were stored nearby. Many synagogues today have genizas in the synagogue itself. It would have been more likely for the people of Qumran to have stored the books they used daily or weekly directly in their settlement, in a building where it could be easily used. These cave 4 scrolls, were, in my opinion, part of a genizia of texts that were in error or unacceptable in other ways, yet could not be merely thrown out, as they contained the Name of God or were part of faulty Scriptural texts.

Additionally, another quote from the Encyclopaedia Judaica supports this. "In talmudic and midrashic literature, however, it is [geniza] used as a nomen actionis (Shab. 16:1; Lev. R. 21:12; Meg. 26b), as a place for the putting away of all kinds of sacred articles, such as sacred books no longer usable, as well as the books of Sadducees and heretics, and other writings of which the sages disapproved but which were not required to be burned" ("Genizah", Encyclopaedia Judaica)

Cave 7 contained a collection of only Greek texts, including 2 LXX fragments on paprus. (Shiffman, p 212).

Clearly, by the time of the Hasmoneans (who were before Jesus in history) at least, the Masoretic texts were the majority texts. Jesus himself followed the same division of the Tanach into Torah, Prophets, and Psalms (ie writings), as it says in Luke 24:44. Jesus never made mention of the "four divisions" of the Greek Bible which was existing in his day.

The texts are sacred to us, so the task of copying them is considered of utmost importance. A number of safe guards are taken to preserve the accuracy by the scribe himself. The congregation who gets the scroll is another check in the accuracy of the scroll. They always have someone checking the Hebrew as the scroll is read, comparing it to a scroll that is known to be Kosher (i.e., without errors). Based on the Biblical scrolls found in Qumran, the Jewish scribes have done a remarkably accurate job of passing the text down for the last 2200 years.

In the approximately 2000 years since the writing of the Dead Sea Scroll Isaiahs, it is interesting to note that the only difference between those and the Masoretic text are minor spelling errors in the DSS Isaiah versions. Scholars interpret this and understand that such "accuracy" for such older manuscripts (the DSS Isaiah almost 1000 years older than any known existing Hebrew manuscript before the find at Qumran) lends credibility and assurance that the older existing Massoretic texts which were previously only known from the 9th century A.D., were just as equally meticulously preserved as well from their earlier sources. So this meticulousness in care and copying of the Hebrew manuscripts has been attested to and proven by archeological finds. Such precision and care can be expected to be applied to all the translations by the Jewish scribes. And when Qumran reveals

Massoretic and pre-Massoretic texts existing contemporary to the Septuagint, then there is no longer any need for doubt reading its accuracy. The problem comes when one realizes that and can no longer blame the divergent readings of the Massoretic texts as Jewish reactionism to Christianity in the Middle Ages. This simply will not hold water any longer. One must now deal with these divergent readings found at Qumran and as attested in the Jewish Tanakh as they oppose many readings in the Greek Septuagint and the later Christian translations.

It is also important to note that in communities as far apart as Syria or Yemin and England, isolated from each other, the Torah is the same. This is amazing given the distance between them before the age of mass communication and given the isolation of the 2 communities from each other. They were not comparing notes, but copying the Torah from previous ones in their possession. This attests to the accurate transmission of the Torah and Tanach following the scribal methods.

In contrast, early in Church history, a Church Father set out to make a standard version of the LXX, due to the fact that there were so many versions out there.

Origen became alarmed at the state of the Greek text of the Bible: the latter not only differed considerably from the Hebrew text of the Jews, which he believed to be the original one, but it appeared in a wide range of forms in the manuscripts current among the Christians. His purpose in producing his enormous work known as the Hexapla ("the sixfold," completed in 245 C.E.) was to reconstitute and standardize the "genuine" text of the Septuagint, essential both to sound exegesis and effective apologetics.

The Hexapla did not become preeminent throughout the Christian world, since, at the end of the fourth century, Jerome referred to the existence of two other recensions, one Egyptian by Hesychius, and the other made in Asia Minor by Lucian. The existence of these three versions might in itself afford a sufficient explanation of the many discrepancies displayed by the Septuagint manuscripts (Encyclopaedia Judaica, "Bible: Translations").

Considering the painstaking accuracy with which the Tanach is copied, I would rather rely on the oldest Hebrew manuscripts we have today and their translation rather than the Greek mistranslation, no matter how good it might be or others attest to it. You see, the language of the translation limits its accuracy. Greek is very different from Hebrew, and the translation was designed to meet the needs of a Greek-speaking audience. The language you use colors the meaning, and the LXX is thus colored by the Greek language let alone purposefully mistranslated in many, many places. Something that might be of interest to you. Origen, one of the Church father's, believed that the Hebrew text of the Jews was the original text. (Encyclopaedia Judaica, "Bible", p853). Many modern translations, such as the NRSV, make use of the Hebrew Masoretic text.



THE HEBREW MASORETIC TEXT...OR THE GREEK SEPTUAGINT...WHICH IS FROM GOD?

"What advantage then hath the Jew? or what profit is there of circumcision? Much every way: chiefly, because that unto them were committed the oracles of God." (Rom. 3:1-2)

According to the Bible, the Hebrews were given charge of keeping and copying God's word. The word "oracle" means revelation, prophecy, canon, or edict. It was unto the Jew, that the Old Testament revelation and canon were committed. This is why twice in the Old Testament they were instructed not to add to or take from the word of God:

"Ye shall not add unto the word which I command you, neither shall ye diminish ought from it, that ye may keep the commandments of the LORD your God which I command you." (Deut. 4:2).

"Add thou not unto his words, lest he reprove thee, and thou be found a liar." (Prov. 30:6).

MAKING SURE THE COMMANDMENTS WERE OBEYED WHEN COPYING THE MANUSCRIPTS

The faithful Hebrew scribe took this task very seriously. Precise steps were taken by the scribes in preparing both the parchment upon which they wrote, and in preparing themselves in order to copy God's Holy word. According to the Hebrew Talmud, the rules of the scribe consisted of the following:

- 1). The skins of the parchments had to be prepared in a special way and dedicated to God so that they would be clean in order to have God's words written on them.**
- 2). The ink which was used was black and made in accordance to a special recipe used only for writing scripture.**
- 3). The words written could not be duplicated by memory but must be reproduced from an authentic copy which the scribe had before him. And, the scribe had to say each word aloud when he wrote them.**
- 4). Each time the scribe came across the Hebrew word for God, he had to wipe his pen clean. And when he came across the name of God, Jehovah (YHWH), he had to wash his whole body before he could write it.**
- 5). If a sheet of parchment had one mistake on it, the sheet was condemned. If there were three mistakes found on any page, the whole manuscript was condemned. Each scroll had to be checked within thirty days of its writing, or it was considered unholy.**
- 6). Every word and every letter was counted. If a letter or word were omitted, the manuscript was condemned.**
- 7). There were explicit rules for how many letters and words allowed on any given parchment. A column must**

have at least 48 lines and no more than 60. Letters and words had to be spaced at a certain distance and no word could touch another.

CONFIRMING TESTIMONY TO THE METICULOUSNESS IN THE COPYING OF THE JEWISH BIBLE

Commenting on these rules, Dr. H.S. Miller writes, "Some of these rules may appear extreme and absurd, yet they show how sacred the Holy Word of the Old Testament was to its custodians, the Jews (Rom. 3:2), and they gave us strong encouragement to believe that we have the real Old Testament, the same on which our Lord had and which was originally given by inspiration of God" (General Biblical Introduction, p. 185).

In his book, The Text of the Old Testament, Dr. Ernst Wurthwein writes, "This was the purpose of the scribes' meticulous work. They counted the verses, words, and letters of the Law and other parts of the Scriptures as a procedural aid in preparing manuscripts and in checking their accuracy." (Eerdmans Publishing, 1979, p. 19).

The Jewish historian Josephus (37-95 AD) comments on the preciseness of the Jewish scribes and their faithfulness in copying the Old Testament scriptures. "...for during so many ages as have already passed, no one has been so bold as either to add anything to them; but it becomes natural to all Jews, immediately and from their very birth, to esteem those books to contain divine doctrines, and to persist in them, and, if occasion be, willingly to die for them." (Flavius Josephus, Against Apion 1:8). Some have taken Josephus' statement to mean the contents of the Old Testament. Other have understood it to mean the canon of the Old Testament. Either way, his statement affirms the sacredness the Hebrews have for Holy Scripture.

WHAT THE DEAD SEA SCROLLS TAUGHT US...THAT WE HAD WRONG

For years it had been thought that the Bible which Christ used was the Greek Septuagint (also known as the LXX). The common thought was that the Jews at the time of Christ had all but lost their use of Hebrew. Since the international language of that day was Greek, the hypothesis was that Christ did not use the Hebrew scriptures, but read from the Greek LXX. However, with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls it has been established that the Jews did not lose their use of Hebrew. In fact, most of their writings (both sacred and otherwise) were written in Hebrew.

Alan Millard has written the following about the Dead Sea Scrolls (DSS) and their relation to ancient languages. "Aramaic, Greek, Latin... was Hebrew spoken too? For years scholars believed not, or that it was restricted to religious circles, synagogue readings and prayers, and the Temple. Counting in favor of a wider knowledge is the presence of Hebrew inscriptions on the other side of Hasmonean coins. That might mean no more than Latin legends on coins of recent times--a grand style which the educated could understand. However, recent discoveries have thrown new light on the question. Books in a style of Hebrew imitating the Old Testament yet distinct from it, and some in Hebrew more like that of the Mishnah make up a larger section of the Dead Sea Scrolls" (Discoveries From the Time of Jesus, Lion Pub., Oxford; p. 35. Professor Millard has served with the British Museum in the Department of Western Asiatic Antiquities and is Rankin Reader in Hebrew and Ancient Semitic languages at the University of Liverpool).

WHICH OLD TESTAMENT DID JESUS READ...THE JEWISH ONE OR THE ONE WE HAVE TODAY AS CHRISTIANS WHICH CAME FROM THE GREEK?

This discovery confirms what we find in the Gospels concerning the Hebrew Old Testament used by Jesus. In Matthew, Jesus proclaims; "For verily I say unto you, Till heaven and earth pass, one jot or one tittle shall in

no wise pass from the law, till all be fulfilled." (Matt. 5:18). It is interesting that he used the words "jot" and "tittle." In the Wycliffe Bible Commentary, Dr. Homer Kent of Grace Theological Seminary writes, "Jot. Smallest letter of the Hebrew alphabet (yodh). Tittle. Tiny projection on certain Hebrew letters." (p.937). The smallest part of the letters Jesus used to describe the fact that the law would not pass until all was fulfilled, were Hebrew. **This would be odd if Jesus were reading from a Greek Old Testament.**

Further, Jesus says in Luke 11:51; "From the blood of Abel unto the blood of Zacharias, which perished between the altar and the temple: verily I say unto you, It shall be required of this generation." **This statement attests that Jesus used the Hebrew canon of scripture and not the Greek translation which was available in his day.** The order of books found in our Old Testament run from Genesis to Malachi. The Greek LXX has the same order but adds additional books (the Apocrypha). The Hebrew canon, while containing the same books as our Old Testament, places the order of the books differently. The Hebrew Bible runs from Genesis to 2 Chronicles with the minor prophets in the middle and not the end as in our Old Testament. We know that Abel was killed by his brother according to Genesis 4:8. Zacharias was killed in 2 Chronicles 24:20-22. Thus showing the first and last to die according to the Jewish Bible. Dr. Merrill Tenney agrees by simply stating, "Able was the first martyr of the OT history. Zacharias was the last, according to the order of books in the Hebrew Bible, which, unlike the English Bible, ends with Chronicles." (Ibid. p.1049). With these things in mind, we can safely say the Bible of Jesus was a Hebrew Bible.

THE MASORETIC TEXT:

The Masoretic Text is the traditional Hebrew Old Testament text of both Judaism and Protestantism (The Catholic Church, historically, used the Latin translation of Jerome based on the Greek LXX). Masoretic comes from the word "Masora" which usually refers to the notes printed beside the Hebrew text by Jewish scribes and scholars.

Until recently, the oldest manuscripts of the Hebrew Old Testament dated from the ninth century and onward. These Hebrew manuscripts of the middle ages are in general agreement. The Biblia Hebraica by Kittel is the basic Hebrew Old Testament used by scholars and translators and is based on the Masoretic Text from this time period. However, with the discovery of the Dead Sea Scrolls manuscripts which date from around 168 BC to about 68 AD. **Thus providing us with Hebrew manuscripts which outdate the previous manuscripts by about 1,000 years. What is interesting to the student of textual criticism and the believer in Biblical preservation, is the fact that a large number of the DSS agree with the Masoretic Text and against the Septuagint reading!** Although there are some manuscripts within the findings of the DSS which agree with the LXX and also reflect a differing Hebrew Text with a number of variants, the fact remains that we now have manuscripts dating from the time of Jesus or before which agree with the Masoretic Text. **This give additional credence to the preciseness and integrity of the Hebrew scribes in their accuracy of reproducing the manuscripts throughout the ages. And, most importantly, it shows the preservation of the Old Testament Text in Hebrew by God.**

Dr. Emanuel Tov of the Hebrew University in Jerusalem and one of the editors of the DSS writes: "Of similar importance are the new data about the context of the biblical scrolls, **since different texts are recognizable [this is explained when one understands the evolution of the Essene sect and their evolving religious beliefs from fundamental Judaism in 170 B.C. E. to Pythagorean-Buddhist apocalypticism in pre 70 A.D.].** Some texts reflect precisely the consonantal framework of the medieval MT (Masoretic Text). Others reflect the basic framework of the MT, although their spelling is different. Still others differ in many details from the MT, while agreeing with the Septuagint or Samaritan Pentateuch. Some texts do not agree with any previously known text at all, and should be considered independent textual traditions. Thus, the textual picture presented by the Qumran scrolls represents a textual variety that was probably typical for the period." (The Oxford Companion to the Bible edited by Bruce Metzger and Michael Coogan, 1993; p.160)

Norman Geisler and William Nix attest to most of the DSS reflecting the Masoretic Text. In their book, A General Introduction to the Bible, they write, **"The (Dead Sea) scrolls give an overwhelming confirmation of the fidelity of the Masoretic text."** (p. 261). They go on to cite Millar Burrows' work, "The Dead Sea Scrolls," "It is

a matter of wonder, " states Burrows, "that through something like a thousand years the text underwent so little alteration. As I said in my first article on the scroll, 'Herein lies its chief importance, supporting the fidelity of the Masoretic tradition.'" (Ibid.). Ernst Wurthwein cites R. de Vaux as saying, "The script is more developed, the Biblical text is definitely that of the Masora, and it must be concluded from this that **the documents from Qumran (i.e. DSS) are older, earlier than the second century [B.C.E.]**" (Wurthwein, p. 31). Concerning the scrolls of Isaiah found in Cave 1 at Qumran, Wurthwein writes, "The scrolls (1QIsa. a.) has a popular type text which supports (the Masoretic Text) essentially, but which also offers a great number of variants. . .A second Isaiah manuscripts (1QIsa. b.) is fragmentary, but stands much closer to the Masoretic text." (Ibid. p. 32).

Additional manuscripts have also been found which support the Masoretic Text. Again Wurthwein informs us of the following: "Also important are the remains of fourteen scrolls with Biblical texts from the period before AD 73, discovered while excavating the rock fortress of Masada in the Judean desert in 1963-1965. These agree extensively with the traditional Biblical texts--only in the text of Ezekiel are there a few insignificant variants." (Ibid. p. 31). To these we can also add the Geniza Fragments which date from the fifth century AD. These manuscripts were discovered in 1890 at Cairo, Egypt. They were located in a type of storage room for worn or faulty manuscripts, which was called the Geniza. The fragments number around 200,000 and reflect Biblical texts in Hebrew, Aramaic, and Arabic. **The Biblical texts discovered support the Masoretic Text.**

In one sense, the Masoretic Text may be thought of as the Textus Receptus of the Old Testament. In fact, some scholars have referred to it as such. Like the Textus Receptus of the New Testament, the Masoretic Text is based on the majority of manuscripts and reflects the traditional text used. Although there are differences found in some Masoretic Texts, these differences are minor and usually deal with, orthography, vowel points, accents, and divisions of the text. In 1524/25, Daniel Bomberg published an edition of the Masoretic Text based on the tradition of Jacob ben Chayyim. Jacob ben Chayyim was a Jewish refugee who later became a Christian. It was his text which was used by the translators of the King James Bible for their work in the Old Testament, and it was the basis of Kittel's first two editions of his Hebrew text. Wurthwein notes that the text of ben Chayyim, "enjoyed an almost canonical authority up to our own time." (Ibid. p. 37).

For about six generations the Masoretic Text was reproduced by the ben Asher family. Moses ben Asher produced a text in 895 AD known as Codex Cairensis containing the writing of the Prophets. Codex Leningradensis dates to 1008 AD and was based on the work of Aaron ben Moses ben Asher, the son of Moses ben Asher. This Codex is the oldest manuscript containing the complete Bible. Some of the differences found within this family of manuscripts are the basis of Kittel's third edition of his Biblia Hebraica and has been used by scholars in producing modern translations of the Bible, such as the New International Version (1978), the New King James Version (1982), and the New Revised Standard Version (1989).

For the most part, scholarship agrees that the Masoretic Text became the standard authorized Hebrew text around 100 AD in connection with the completion of the New Testament.

Thus we see that the Masoretic Text existed prior to the writings of the New Testament, was used as the official Hebrew Old Testament at the time of the establishing of the Biblical canon, and has been used since as the official representation of the Hebrew originals.

THE GREEK SEPTUAGINT:

The most noted Old Testament translated into Greek is the Septuagint (also known as the LXX). The conventional thought is that the LXX was translated from the Hebrew text by Hellenistic Jews during the period from 275 to 100 BC at Alexandria, Egypt. **This has been proven legend today!** And, as pointed out by scholars such as Ralph W. Klein, **the LXX used a differing Hebrew text and not that of the Masoretic Text type, as reflected in some of the finding among the DSS.** The LXX was used by Jerome in producing his Old Testament of the Latin Vulgate used by the Roman Catholic Church, and the LXX remains the official Old Testament of the Greek Orthodox Church. This accounts for the additional books found in the Catholic and

Orthodox Churches known as the Apocrypha, because they are contained in the text of the LXX.

The association of the Latin numbers LXX (meaning 70) with the Septuagint comes from the legend concerning the origin of this Greek translation. According to the Letter of Aristeas seventy Jewish scholars were chosen to translate the Law of Moses into Greek so that it could be added to the great library of Ptolemy Philadelphus in Alexandria, Egypt. The letter states that the High Priest in Jerusalem sent 72 scholars to the Egyptian king. The High Priest writes, "In the presence of all the people I selected six elders from each tribe, good men and true, and I have sent them to you with a copy of our law. It will be a kindness, O righteous king, if you will give instruction that as soon as the translation of the law is completed, the men shall be restored again to us in safety." (Letter of Aristeas 2:34-35). Thus six scholars from the twelve tribes number seventy-two (it is to be assumed that the 70 is merely a rounding off of the 72).

One wide-spread myth concerning the LXX is an old story which states that the translators worked on their translation alone and compared their work each morning, only to find that each had translated the passage exactly the same. This, of course, has no historical foundation and some have falsely applied this story to the translators of the King James Bible. However, stories such as this one caused some to claim inspiration for the LXX.

Dr. Karlfried Froehlich notes this and writes, "Inspiration was also claimed for the Greek translation of the 'Seventy', which was endorsed by Alexandrian Jewish authorities. In Christian eyes, the legend of the Septuagint's miraculous origin, first told in the Letter of Aristeas, then elaborated by Philo, and further embellished by Christian authors such as Justin Martyr, Irenaeus of Lyons, Tertullian, and Augustine, even rendered the Septuagint superior to the Hebrew original." (The Oxford Companion to the Bible, p. 310).

Answer for yourself: Since when does "legend" render a fraud as superior a document which, upon comparison with the source document (the Jewish Palestinian text) be shown to contain hundreds of purposeful mistranslations for theological purposes?

Even if the story given in the Letter of Aristeas were true, the Greek translation deals only with the first five books of the Old Testament. Most scholars note that there are differences in style and quality of translation within the LXX and assign a much greater time frame than the seventy-two days allotted in the Letter of Aristeas. In his book, Textual Criticism of the Old Testament: The Septuagint after Qumran, Ralph Klein notes, "the Letter of Aristeas is riddled with many historical improbabilities and errors. . .And yet, however legendary and improbable the details, many still believe that some accurate historical facts about the LXX can be distilled from Aristeas: (1) the translation began in the third century BC; (2) Egypt was the place of origin; and (3) the Pentateuch was done first." (p. 2).

Dr. F. F. Bruce correctly points out that, strictly speaking, the LXX deals only with the Law and not the whole Old Testament. Bruce writes, "The Jews might have gone on at a later time to authorize a standard text of the rest of the Septuagint, but . . . lost interest in the Septuagint altogether. With but few exceptions, every manuscript of the Septuagint which has come down to our day was copied and preserved in Christian, not Jewish, circles." (The Books and the Parchments, p.150). This is important to note because the manuscripts which consist of our LXX today date to the third century AD. Although there are fragments which pre-date Christianity and some of the Hebrew DSS agree with the LXX, the majority of manuscripts we have of the LXX date well into the Christian era. And, not all of these agree.

The most noted copy of the LXX is that found in the Hexapla by Origen. Origen produced an Old Testament with six translations paralleled together, called the Hexapla which means sixfold. The fifth column was the LXX. (The columns of the Hexapla were as follows: 1. The Hebrew text. 2. The Hebrew transliterated into Greek. 3. The Greek translation of Aquila. 4. The Greek translation of Symmachus. 5. The LXX. 6. The Greek translation of Theodotion.) However, we do not have Origen's Hexapla (with the exception of a few limited fragments). Sir Frederic Kenyon wrote, "A considerable number of MSS. exist which give information as to Origen's Hexaplaric text and particular passages in the other columns, but these do not go far towards enabling us to recover the LXX text as it existed before Origen; and this remains the greatest problem which confronts the

textual student of the Septuagint. Until we can do that, we are not in a position fully to utilize the evidence of the Greek for the recovery of the pre-Masoretic Hebrew." (The Text of the Greek Bible, p.35). In other words, we cannot fully reconstruct Origen's fifth column, let alone a pre-Origenian Septuagint.

Origen's LXX was revised and edited by two of his disciples, Pamphilus and Eusebius. There were additional Greek translations of the Old Testament during this time which were also contained in the Hexapla, such as the work by Aquila and Theodotion. Some scholars believe that the translation produced by Theodotion replaced the LXX in the book of Daniel so that the readings there are really that of Theodotion and not of the LXX. However, others have claimed that this is not the case. Therefore, concerning Origen's Hexapla and the LXX the best scholars can say is that cited by Ernst Wurthwein, "Although no authentic manuscript of the Hexaplaric Septuagint has survived, there are manuscripts which represent the text of Origen more or less closely." (The Text of the Old Testament, p.57). Two such manuscripts which represent the text of Origen are Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus.

THE LXX AND THE KJV TRANSLATORS

It is interesting to note in our study of manuscript evidence and the King James Bible, how the translators of the KJV viewed the LXX. This Greek work did not go unnoticed by these men as can be seen in the original preface to the KJV written by Dr. Miles Smith. The following are a few paragraphs from the KJV preface for the student to consider. Afterwards, comments will be made.

1) "Notwithstanding, though it was commended generally, yet it did not fully content the learned, no not of the Jews. For not long after Christ, Aquila fell in hand with a new Translation, and after him Theodotion, and after him Symmachus; yea, there was a fifth and a sixth edition, the Authors whereof were not known. (Epiphan. de mensur. et ponderibus.) These with the Seventy made up the Hexapla and were worthily and to great purpose compiled together by Origen."

2) "Yet for all that, as the Egyptians are said of the Prophet to be men and not God, and their horses flesh and not spirit (Isa 31:3); so it is evident, (and Saint Jerome affirmed as much) (S. Jerome. de optimo genere interpret.) that the Seventy were Interpreters, they were not Prophets; they did many things well, as learned men; but yet as men they stumbled and fell, one while through oversight, another while through ignorance, yea, sometimes they may be noted to add to the Original, and sometimes to take from it; which made the Apostles to leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the spirit gave them utterance. This may suffice touching the Greek Translations of the Old Testament."

3) "Now to the latter we answer; that we do not deny, nay we affirm and avow, that the translation of the Bible in English, set forth by men of our profession, (for we have seen none of theirs of the whole Bible as yet) containeth the word of God, nay, is the word of God. As the King's speech, which he uttereth in Parliament, being translated into French, Dutch, Italian, and Latin, is still the King's speech, though it be not interpreted by every Translator with the like graadventure so fitly for phrase, nor so expressly for sense, everywhere. . The Romanists therefore in refusing to hear, and daring to burn the Word translated, did no less than despite the spirit of grace, from whom originally it proceeded, and whose sense and meaning, as well as man's weakness would able, it did express. . .The like we are to think of Translations. The translation of the Seventy dissenteth from the Original in many places, neither doth it come near it, for perspicuity, gravity, majesty; yet which of the Apostles did condemn it? Condemn it? Nay, they used it, . . .To be short, Origen, and the whole Church of God for certain hundred years, were of another mind: for they were so far from treading under foot, (much more from burning) the Translation of Aquila a Proselyte, that is, one that had turned Jew; of Symmachus, and Theodotion, both Ebionites, that is, most vile heretics, that they joined together with the Hebrew Original, and the Translation of the Seventy (as hath been before signified out of Epiphanius) and set them forth openly to be considered of and perused by all. But we weary the unlearned, who need not know so much, and trouble the learned, who know it already."

In the first paragraph we find that the KJV translators attest to Origen's Hexapla and early Greek translations

of the Old Testament which post-date the birth of Christianity. These translations, along with the LXX, paralleled in the Hexapla.

The second paragraph shows that the KJV translators saw some of the limitations of the LXX. **They recognized that the LXX was produced by Interpreters and not by inspired Prophets. Although the LXX translates many things well, it also failed many times and departed from the original Hebrew (i.e. Masoretic Text). Sometimes the LXX adds to the Hebrew, and at other times it omits. Which, according the KJV translators, made the New Testament writers to, "leave them many times, when they left the Hebrew, and to deliver the sense thereof according to the truth of the word, as the spirit gave them utterance."** This simply means that when a New Testament writer cites the LXX, they freely corrected the LXX when it differed from the Hebrew, or as they were moved by inspiration.

The third paragraph is lengthy to show the context. The KJV translators promoted the use of translations. Not as we have come to understand it with a variety of versions differing from one another, but the importance of having the word of God translated into the language of those who cannot read Hebrew or Greek. Their argument was against the Catholic Church which at that time made it a practice of burning Bibles which were in any language other than Latin. The Catholic Church considered such translations as corrupt and worthy of burning. The KJV translators are arguing that the history of the Church demonstrates that even when a translation is poorly done, God can still use it and it should not be burned, as the Catholic Church had a practice of doing. They illustrate their point with the Greek translations of Aquila and Theodotion, which were translated by non-believers and yet their work was not burned by believers. They claim the same with the LXX.

THE LXX AND THE NEW TESTAMENT.....LET'S COMPARE AGAINST THE JEWISH PALESTINIAN MASORETIC TEXT...AND YOU SEE FOR YOURSELF

There are several places where the New Testament quotations of the Old Testament are said to be citations of the LXX. What you need to be concerned about is if this quotation from the LXX as found in your New Testament is faithfully represented as it is worded in the Jewish Scriptures. What you will see if you take the following test is that the New Testament writers are guilty of mishandling and abuse of Jewish Scripture in order to create a new religion and replace the faith of Jesus with one created about him. Without a good background in the Jewish Old Testament one reads the New Testament and notices that it is full of Old Testament quotes all the while believing that these Old Testament quotes refers in some way to Yeshua. But these as well as many other quotes in the New Testament supposedly referring to Yeshua have been lifted out of their original context and used in ways contrary to their original meanings. We end up thinking that the Old Testament was prophesying the coming of Yeshua, when in reality, the passages quoted by the New Testament writers had nothing to do with him at all.

Answer for yourself: How are you to know if what I said is true?

Let me show you! Now you can approach this two different ways. You can look up the New Testament quote and reference it to the more than likely mistranslated and misquoted passage in your Christian Old Testament (as taken from the LXX) and you won't detect any difference. Or you can go out and buy a Stone Edition Tanakh which is as faithful a Jewish translation of the Old Testament as you could get today. Then open all three books at once to the passage in question and compare them according to the following parameters:

Take your New Testament quote then run its source in your Christian OT and then in the Jewish Tanakh. Next compare these three passages according to the following parameters.

Let me give you again the mechanics involved in textual manipulation whereby we end up with something different in meaning that the original author intended.

1. Were the Jewish texts and phrases are lifted out of their places and contexts in the Hebrew Scriptures and

given meanings which, at best, are forced and alien to what the original writer intended his audience to understand?

2. Preceding many of the prophetic verses in the New Testament is the emendation: "What was said through the prophet was thus fulfilled." In this way the writers of the Christian Scriptures endeavored to show that the Tanakh anticipated and predicted the events recorded in the New Testament. If you determined that the above #1 criteria was violated then understand what you are reading in the New Testament is anything but a "fulfillment."

3. Understand the techniques employed to establish false proof-texts: the citation of verses out of context, purposeful mistranslation, and purposeful misquotation to serve a theological agenda of the translators.

4. Sometimes a figurative or poetic phrase is mistaken for a straightforward statement and vice versa.

5. Sometimes sayings of different writers, living in different places, and in different centuries are run together.

6. Often two or more of these methods are used in a single quotation.

The following is a list provided by the American Bible Society (ABS) of LXX readings in the NT. The OT passage is given first, followed by the NT citation of it in parentheses. This list may not be complete but presented for your own homework.

Genesis 5:24 (Heb. 11:5) Genesis 46:27 (Acts. 7:14) Genesis 47:31 (Heb. 11:21) Exodus 9:16 (Rom. 9:17) Deuteronomy 17:7 (1 Cor. 5:13) Deuteronomy 18:15 (Acts 3:22) Deuteronomy 27:26 (Gal. 3:10) Deuteronomy 29:18 (Heb. 12:15) Deuteronomy 32:17 (1 Cor. 10:20) Deuteronomy 32:43 (Heb. 1:6) Psalm 2:1-2 (Acts 4:25-26) Psalm 2:9 (Rev. 2:27) Psalm 4:4 (Eph. 4:26) Psalm 5:9 (Rom. 3:13) Psalm 8:2 (Matt. 21:16) Psalm 8:5 (Heb. 2:7) Psalm 10:7 (Rom. 3:14) Psalm 14:3 or 53:3 (Rom. 3:12) Psalm 16:8-11 (Acts 2:25-28) Psalm 19:4 (Rom. 10:18) Psalm 34:12 (1 Pet. 3:10) Psalm 40:6 (Heb. 10:5) Psalm 51:4 (Rom. 3:4) Psalm 69:22-23 (Rom. 11:9-10) Psalm 95:7-8 (Heb. 3:15; 4:7) Psalm 102:25-27 (Heb. 1:10-12) Psalm 104:4 (Heb. 1:7) Psalm 116:10 (2 Cor. 4:13) Psalm 118:6 (Heb. 13:6) Proverbs 3:4 (2 Cor. 8:21) Proverbs 3:34 (James 4:6; 1 Pet. 5:5) Proverbs 3:11-12 (Heb. 12:5-6) Proverbs 4:26 (Heb. 12:13) Proverbs 11:31 (1 Pet. 4:18) Proverbs 25: 21-22 (Rom. 12:20) Isaiah 1:9 (Rom. 9:29) Isaiah 6:9-10 (Matt. 13:14-15; Mark 4:12; Luke 8:10; John 12:40; Acts 28:26-27) Isaiah 7:14 (Matt. 1:23) Isaiah 10:22-23 (Rom. 9:27-28) Isaiah 11:10 (Rom. 15:12) Isaiah 26:11 (Heb. 10:27) Isaiah 28:16 (Rom. 9:33; 10:11; 1 Pet. 2:6) Isaiah 29:13 (Matt. 15:8-9; Mark 7:6-7) Isaiah 29:14 (1 Cor. 1:19) Isaiah 40:3-5 (Matt. 3:3; Mark 1:3; Luke 3:4-6) Isaiah 40:6-7 (James 1:10-11; 1 Pet. 1:24) Isaiah 40:13 (Rom. 11:34; 1 Cor. 2:16) Isaiah 42:4 (Matt. 12:21) Isaiah 43:20 (1 Pet. 2:9) Isaiah 45:23 (Rom. 14:11; Phil. 2:11) Isaiah 52:5 (Rom. 2:24) Isaiah 52:15 (Rom. 15:21) Isaiah 53:1 (John 12:38, 40; Rom. 10:16) Isaiah 59:20-21 (Rom. 11:26-27) Isaiah 61:1 (Luke 4:18) Isaiah 65:1-2 (Rom. 10:20-21) Jeremiah 31:32 (Heb. 8:9) Ezekiel 28:13 (Rev. 2:7) Hosea 13:14 (1 Cor. 15:55) Joel 2:30-31 (Acts 2:19-20) Amos 5:25-27 (Acts 13:34) Amos 9:11-12 (Acts 15:16-18) Habakkuk 1:5 (Acts 13:41) Habakkuk 2:4 (Heb. 10:38) Haggai 2:5 (Heb. 12:26)

As one can see, the list is rather lengthy (and I might add incomplete). It would be rather tedious to compare all the verses in this list. But that is exactly what you have to do if you are to see for yourself where the New Testament rendering of a passage, as taken from your Christian Old Testament, as taken from the Greek translation is completely and diametrically opposed to the rendering as originally taken from the Jewish Masoretic text.

I would also recommend a final test to prove to you what I said is true. Buy another book: Anti-semitism in the New Testament by Lillian Freudmann. Read this book page by page with all three of the above Bibles open (the Jewish OT, the Christian OT, and the NT). Read page by page and compare every passage with these three sources all the while remembering that we non-Jews who are "believers" deserved a translation and not a free creationism! Read this book and then try to tell yourself that the NT is not forged because your Old Testament was forged to begin with!

I wish to be fair to the case in point. There are many times when the Greek of the LXX and the NT match word

perfectly. To explain this the ABS states, "The writers of the New Testament generally quoted or paraphrased the ancient Greek translation of the Old Testament, commonly known as the Septuagint Version," (New Testament Passages Quoted or Paraphrased from the Septuagint, found in the TEV, Thomas Nelson Pub. 1976 ed. p. 367). The problem here is that once we open the possibility that many of the citations are not quotations but "paraphrases" of the LXX, we cannot be certain that it was in fact the LXX that was paraphrased.

Since there are differences between the NT citations and both the LXX and the Masoretic Text, the question arises as to what translation the writers of the NT used. At times it seems as if they are using the traditional Hebrew text, at other times it seems as if they are taking great liberties with the Hebrew text. Sometimes their quote matches the LXX, and at other times their citation differs from the LXX.

Answer for yourself: As Bible believing Christians, how do we resolve this dilemma?

Here is the Christian scholar's answer. I find it totally insufficient. Simply said, my research has shown that the Jewish texts were altered by the Greek-Jewish Pythagorean-Buddhists of Alexandria to promote their unique sect's religious beliefs. These alterations were only magnified as later recorded and quoted in the New Testament. The majority of Christian writers, when advised of this respond usually with this reply:

"Finally, we must remember that the writers of the NT had a unique position which we are not allotted today. They wrote under inspiration. **They had the right to change the text**, for it was in reality God who was doing the changing in that it is His word. This was recognized by the translators of the KJV. They understood that **the Biblical writers would sometimes use a certain text and alter it, "as the spirit gave them utterance"**. Thus the writers of the NT had a unique liberty, and an awesome responsibility."

They just told you God cannot say the same thing twice nor make up his mind!

CLEMENT AND THE LXX:

In accordance with this same historical time frame, Sir Frederic Kenyon has pointed out that, "(The LXX) was not . . . accepted by the stricter Jews, who in controversy repudiated arguments based on Septuagint texts." (The Text of the Greek Bible, p.29). This is also true of Josephus who rejected the LXX because of its additions to the Hebrew canon of scripture.

Likewise, scholarship recognizes that the enhancement of the LXX in history came not from the Jewish scribes, but from sources within Christendom from around the third century.

In other words many alterations and interpolations to the Jewish Masoretic Text were made by Christians to make "prophecies" out of non-prophecies, to create Messianic passages which were never meant by the original writers to be Messianic, and literally "Jesusize" passages that never referred to him in the first place. In doing this they "added to" and "took away from the Word of God!"

Then these same forged passages were quoted in the New Testament writings and applied to Jesus when they were originally added to the Jewish Scriptures by the Pythagorean-Greek-Jews of Alexandria to refer to their sun-g-d myths and sun-g-d redeemers.

Then we lost the truth about the Historical Jesus!

As to its value in the study of textual criticism, Dr. Ernst Wurthwein writes, "No other version has received as much attention for textual criticism as (the LXX). Not only was it valued highly in antiquity, but in the nineteenth century many scholars practically preferred it over the Masoretic text. They believed that because of

its pre-Christian origins it could assist in the recovery of an earlier, pre-Masoretic text that would be closer to the original than (the Masoretic Text). But today we recognize that (the LXX) neither was nor was intended to be a precise scholarly translation." (The Text of the Old Testament, pp 63-64). Later, Wurthwein quotes Dr. G. Bertram as writing, "The Septuagint belongs to the history of Old Testament interpretation rather than to the history of the Old Testament text. It can be used as a textual witness only after its own understanding of the Old Testament text has been made clear." (Ibid. pp. 67-68).

That is what Bet Emet is trying to tell you. The Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures had its own agenda...and it was not the proliferation of truth!

Therefore we can see that the LXX does not shed light on the text of the original Hebrew, but only on how some deviated from and re-interpreted the Hebrew text to further their sects authority and religious ideology.

Further, we also can see that the Biblical guardians of the Old Testament, the Jews, were not in favor of the readings found in the LXX, nor in the additions it made to the Hebrew canon of scripture.



THE ESSENES AND THEIR INFLUENCE ON THE NEW TESTAMENT

It never ceases to amaze me in my studies the overall failure of Christian commentators to be acquainted with the evolution of the Essenes and their religious doctrines, dogmas, philosophies from generation to generation. It seems as if the vast majority of writers on the Essenes read Josephus, Philo, or Pliny and believe these accounts are a realistic view of this theologically complex group of apocalyptists. An unbiased study of the Essenes will show that this group grew by gradual stages, from a Judaizing program at the beginning into an esoteric cult of celibate-communist apocalyptists at the end which had repudiated Judaism to a wide extent. Serious investigation into these Essenes will reveal how they were able to create in secrecy the elements, which, according to accepted Christian history, were proclaimed for the first time to an astonished public by John the Baptist and Jesus of Nazareth. Their secret doctrines were now for the first time being publicly proclaimed to the masses. The story of the Essenes is in reality the story of the origin of Christianity.

Many writers, including Martin Larson, Dupont-Sommer, Edmund Wilson, John M. Allegro, Robert Eisenmann, L. Schiffman, M. Burrows, G. Vermes, and many others, have given vivid intimations of this. The knowledge gleaned from these men and their research into Essene history as well as their religious doctrines, gives unsuspected light upon the origin of Christianity and the career of its founder, as well as that of a predecessor, the Teacher of Righteousness.

THE HISTORY OF THE EVOLUTION OF THE ESSENES

The Qumran sect's origins are postulated by some scholars to be in the communities of the Hasidim, the pious anti-Hellenistic circles formed in the early days of the Maccabees. The Hasidim may have been the precursors of the Essenes, who were concerned about growing Hellenization and strove to abide by the Torah. Archeological and historical evidence indicates that Qumran was founded in the second half of the second century B.C.E., during the time of the Maccabean dynasty. A hiatus in the occupation of the site is linked to evidence of a huge earthquake. Qumran was abandoned about the time of the Roman incursion of 68 C.E., two years before the collapse of Jewish self-government in Judea and the destruction of the Temple in Jerusalem in 70 C.E. The chief sources of information for the history of this fateful time span are the Qumran scrolls and the excavations, but earlier information on the Essenes was provided by their contemporaries: Josephus Flavius, Philo of Alexandria, and Pliny the Elder. Their summary accounts are continuously being borne out by the site excavations and study of the writings. The historian Josephus relates the division of the Jews of the Second Temple period into three orders: the Sadducees, the Pharisees, and the Essenes. The Sadducees included mainly the priestly and aristocratic families; the Pharisees constituted the lay circles; and the Essenes were a separatist group, part of which formed an ascetic monastic community that retreated to the wilderness. The exact political and religious affinities of each of these groups, as well as their development and interrelationships, are left relatively obscure by these three accounts and more investigation is needed to come to the truth about this group in light of the widely disparate scholarly views that exist today.

The crisis that brought about the secession of the Essenes from mainstream Judaism is thought to

have occurred when the Maccabean ruling princes Jonathan (160-142 B.C.E.) and Simeon (142-134 B.C.E.) usurped the office of high priest (which included secular duties), much to the consternation of conservative Jews; some of them could not tolerate the situation and denounced the new rulers.

The persecution of the Essenes and their leader, the teacher of righteousness probably elicited the sect's apocalyptic visions. These included the overthrow of "the wicked priest" of Jerusalem and of the evil people and, in the dawn of the Messianic Age, the recognition of their community as the true Israel. The retreat of these Jews into the desert would enable them "to separate themselves from the congregation of perverse men (IQ Serekh 5:2).

The Essenes persisted in a separatist existence through two centuries, occupying themselves with study and a communal way of life that included worship, prayer, and work. It is clear, however, that large groups of adherents also lived in towns and villages outside the Qumran area.

By 143 B.C.E., the Zadokites had become known definitely as the Sadducees; and the Chasidim, splitting into two parties, had become known as the Pharisees and the Essenes. The Essenes could be looked upon as "ultra-strict" Pharisees. The Sadducees became identified with the rich and successful; the Pharisees became the popular leaders; and the Essenes gradually evolved into an esoteric communion of celibate communists.

As stated above, it is a shame that so few have endeavored to trace the evolution of these Essenes (Holy Ones) from their pristine, pre-Chasidic beginnings as a Zadokite reaction against Hellenization among the Jews, into the frozen, rigid, esoteric, and celibate-communist mystery-cult which they had become in the days of Philo and Josephus. Until this is done then it is very difficult to look at the writings left from this group of individuals and discern that many of their "religious doctrines" originated outside of normative Judaism and find their points of origin in the Pythagorean, Buddhist, and Iranian religious culture.

There is evidence which indicated that, about 70 B.C.E. or soon thereafter, an Essene prophet known as the Teacher of Righteousness had been put to death by the Jewish authorities because of doctrinal, ritualistic, and organizational heterodoxy; that, in due course, his followers declared that he was God himself, appearing as a man in Jerusalem, and that his death was an atoning sacrifice for the elect; that he arose from the grace and returned to heaven; and that he would send a representative in a few years who would be precisely the kind of Messiah that was proclaimed for Jesus by his followers. There is a strong indication that if Jesus was not at one time affiliated with the Essenes, that he was strongly influenced by them and their doctrines; yet at times we find Jesus' individuality and diversion from some of the Essene tenants. Many feel that Jesus was persuaded that he was himself the Messiah expected by the Essene Community, that he left it and preached the Gospel to the public; and that finally, in a revised concept of his own mission, re-enacted the role and the passion of the slain Teacher, and proclaimed that in his eschatological role he would appear as the last judge and the all-powerful Son of Man.

The book of Acts attests that the core of the pristine Christian communion consisted of individual Essenes who defected to it soon after Jesus' crucifixion; that soon after the destruction of Jerusalem these Essene Priests came over in large numbers and constituted the Christian-Essene communion known as the Ebionites; and, finally, that many of the multifarious primitive Gnostic communions, which flourished during the early centuries of this era, bear the indelible imprint of Essene origin and influence.

Those who speak of "our Judeo-Christian tradition or culture" are laboring under a serious misconception. Ours is not the social, political, or economic system reflected in the Mosaic Law or the Yahweh prophets, which existed in Palestine following David and Solomon; and western life is separated by an even more impassable gulf from the ethics, political economy, and religious discipline set forth in the Essene and Synoptic Scriptures. Our culture is based substantially upon Graeco-Roman antecedents. **The Essenes absorbed their basic ideology originally from Zoroastrianism and later from Greek-mystery sources, particularly Pythagoreanism. The Essenes group, originally a return to Torah movement, would evolve into a group that would reject Judaism in toto; and except for certain Buddhist accretions, Jesus and the pristine church reproduced the Essene pattern faithfully.** Since, however, this form of Christianity was wholly unacceptable

in the pagan world, it was Hellenized in the Pauline literature and the Fourth Gospel, both of which reflect Stoic influence; these eventually became the essential foundation for that reconstruction or restitution of Christianity known as the Protestant Reformation. Ancient Hellenized Christianity itself did not long survive; for the soon-to-be victorious Catholic Church, in order to establish itself as a theocracy, absorbed their most salient elements from the great pagan cults which were its competitors.

It should be obvious to almost any reader or disinterested observer that very few indeed believe and fewer still practice the Gospel as proclaimed in the New Testament, especially the Synoptics. A dwindling minority profess to embrace one or two of its elements, while ignoring the remainder. It is safe to say that not one American in a thousand would accept the Gospel if he were required to live according to its commandments.

Answer for yourself: Why, then, does it continue as the dominant religion of the western world?

Neither inertia or surrender to the past nor yet the power of vested and venerable institutions can explain the power of the Christian religion. For the dominance of Christianity in the western world finds its momentum from the fact that Paul and the writer of the Fourth Gospel Hellenized the pristine Essene evangel, then it was paganized by Catholicism, and then the Protestant Reformation revolutionized, not only the religious, but also the political and economic structure of northern Europe. The broad appeal of Christianity stems from the fact that it is a synthesis of the most important doctrines which had already been developed in the great pre-Christian cultures over a period of centuries. Had this not been so, it would simply have been a restrictive creed and would, like many others, soon have vanished from the stage of history.

The central elements in the Synoptic Gospels are:

- The divine, atoning, and sacrificial savior, who gives his own life to redeem that of his communicants and who, by rising from the grave, is empowered to confer divinity and immortality upon them also
- An ethical system which makes every one economically and politically equal in a social order where want and injustice are forever abolished, and in which the family, based on sex and procreation, is replaced by the larger family of the celibate saints
- An eschatological doctrine, according to which the redeemed will enjoy everlasting happiness in communion with each other in a kingdom of righteousness, from which all others will be banished into everlasting torture
- The promise of an imminent Parousia when the savior will reappear in power to conduct the Last Judgment and institute the everlasting celibate-communal kingdom of heaven on earth, which will then belong to the saints in perpetuity.
- The redeemed were to be healed of all their physical and other maladies for time and eternity

What escapes the understanding of 99.9 % of all Christians is that the immediate source of these concepts for Christianity was the Essene society. Behind the Essenes lie the ultimate origins of these above religious concepts must can be traced to the mystery-cults and the major religions of the pre-Christian world pagan world...such as:

- 1. Egypt and the Original Saviour God...Osiris
- 2. Adonis and Aphrodite
- 3. The Greek Dionysus
- 4. Attis and Cybele
- 5. Demeter and Persephone
- 6. The Orphean Reconstruction of Dionysus
- 7. The Zoroastrians
- 8. Brahmanism-India
- 9. Buddhism

- *10. Pythagoras*
- *11. Isis and Serapis*
- *12. Mithraism*

The Essenes of Jesus' day had evolved into a syncretistic religious group that contained all of the above religious beliefs mixed in with normative Judaism...and out came Christianity after the death of Jesus as some or all of the beliefs from the above varieties of pagan religions was applied to him by the Essenes.

THE TRADITIONAL AND POPULAR MISCONCEPTION CONCERNING THE ESSENES

Most believe, judging by the recent publicity concerning the Dead Sea Scrolls since their discovery, that the casual inquirer might conclude that the existence of the pre-Christian Essene cult was revealed for the first time after a Bedouin boy, following his goat, discovered a cave near the Dead Sea in 1947. Nothing could be further from the truth.

The truth is that many scholars and historians had dealt with this religious organization at length in articles, essays, and even in elaborate scholarly works long before the discovery of the caves. Every competent student of western religion knows well of the celebrated passages in Pliny, Philo, and Josephus describing the Essenes and most take for granted this is all that is needed to be known to describe this religious sect and their beliefs. Again nothing could be further from the truth and far too many Christian writers and "supposed" authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls have failed to look beyond these three "summary statements" in writing upon the pre-Christian Essenes.

Enough material to fill a small library has now been produced concerning the Essenes; and yet, in spite of all the advantages available to modern scholarship, one of the most accurate analyses of them yet today was published in 1889 and was authored by Frederick William Evans. He maintained that Jesus was heavily influenced by Essene theology and was most likely a member of the order at one time (Larson, The Essene Heritage, p. 21). John Allegro also stated: "The Essenes were, many of them, converted on the day of Pentecost, and formed the body of the Jerusalem Church, with its spiritual origin" (John Allegro, The Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 161). Allegro goes on to say: "the members of the first Christian Church 'were Essenes. They loved one another so that they sold their possessions and had all things in common. They forsook the generative life, with its wives and husbands, for Christ's sake and the Gospel's..." Jesus then, taught celibacy and communism; and the first Jerusalem Church consisted largely of Essenes who came over to Christianity.

As stated in another article, the Essenes of Jesus' day were a far cry from the Essenes who began a separatist movement from the Temple and corruption of the Priesthood in roughly 150 B.C.E. Warren Felt Evans, who died in 1889, makes mention of the "method of healing practiced by Jesus, and perhaps also of the mystic Pythagorean sect of the Jews called the Essenes...to which sect Jesus himself unquestionably belonged" (Ibid.). Evans states that the writer of the Gospel of Luke was an Essene (Esoteric Christianity, Boston, 1886, p. 100), and he adds: "Jesus came to do for the world at large, by revealing the sublime wisdom of the ancient mystical sects and brotherhoods, what had been done only for the chosen few in the sacred privacy of the inner recesses of the temple" (Ibid., p. 79). "Jesus, then, according to this was an Essene; the Essenes were Pythagoreans; and the unique mission of Jesus was to reveal the esoteric doctrines of the Essene-Pythagoreans to the world at large" (Larson, The Essene Heritage, p. 21-22).

The surprising this is not that the Essenes have been well known, but that very little has been understood concerning their esoteric nature and doctrines. Even more amazing is the fact that although several of their most important documents have long been extant and widely circulated, not even the most acute scholars ever

suspected the true origin of these before 1947; and that to this day a great deal of confusion persists concerning them.

THE NATURE OF THE ESSENE FAITH

Among a people totally dedicated to religion, the Essenes, from their proto-beginnings to the end of their career, were the most fervent, pietistic, and dedicated. Furthermore, after the consolidation of Yahwism, the Essenes alone were able to absorb the essence of other religions and so create a new and powerful synthesis of their own. It is for these reasons that several Jewish scholars have found it difficult to accept the Essene documents. J. L. Teicher, agreeing with various other writers, maintains that the Essenes were none other than a cult of Christians (Larson, The Essene Heritage, p. 25). Upton C. Ewing believes that all the Christological and Messianic references in Essene literature point only to the founder of Christianity, that they are, therefore, genuinely prophetic, and that there was only a single cult of this kind in Palestine, which might be called Essene-Christian (The Prophet of the Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 132-133).

But before we call this religious sectarian group "proto-Christian" we need to look at the religious beliefs they held; both in the beginning of their conception as well as their demise.

Like many other cults, the Essenes began by accepting the dominant religion of Judaism and its Scriptures; before very long they were creating new and divergent revelations, which to them in time became superior to the orthodox or to the writings of Moses. Every successful prophet builds upon, but remakes, the doctrines and practices accepted by his prospective converts. Thus, almost every new faith possesses in reality two related but also disparate scriptures: first, the established and conventional; and, second, the new revelations, the distinctive possession of the avant-garde. Thereupon, the cult takes the next step; it claims also a unique power to interpret the old canon. Thus, the new communion become independent. Almost from the beginning the Essenes began the creation of new scriptures; and they believed with realizing certainty that their leader, known in successive generations as the Teacher of Righteousness, the Master of Justice, the Man Who Reneweth the Law, etc., alone could reveal the esoteric and prophetic meanings of the orthodox Jewish canon (Larson, The Essene Heritage, p. 26-27).

THE ESSENE METHODOLOGY IN CREATING NEW SCRIPTURE

Answer for yourself: What is the pseudepigraphic technique as used by the Essenes?

The Essenes were certain that their scriptures, especially the Book of Enoch, possessed unquestionable priority and supremacy. The unparalleled authority of such works lay in their exact prophecies, accurate to the date of composition, which the amazed communicant could easily understand. These already-accomplished predictions were then followed by others for which similar and imminent fulfillment was confidently expected. This is known as the pseudepigraphic method; and behind it lies a long and interesting story.

When the Jewish priests consolidated their power after the return from Babylon, they outlawed all prophecy (Zech. 13:3-6), since that could disturb the public tranquillity and discredit the incumbent priesthood. The purpose of this proscription was to freeze the existing canon. The ingenuity of man, however, is not so easily thwarted; and effective techniques were developed by which new revelations could be promulgated. The ban against prophecy gave rise to the literary form known as the pseudepigraphic apocalypse, which was to play so large a role for several centuries in Jewish life.

The method is daring: a fervent prophet with an irrepressible message composes a "revelation" which he attributes to some ancient personage, provides a suitable historical setting, delineates history up to his own day under an easily understood symbolism, and the, relying on the credit established for the immediate future, especially an eschatological cataclysm. The Chasids, the Essenes, and the Pharisees became masters of this pseudepigraphic method and, by its use, composed an entire corpus of extraordinary literature, edited by R.H. Charles and published in 1913 as the Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.

THE EVOLUTION OF THE ESSENE CULT

THE ZADOKITE PERIOD 195-175 B.C.E.

For want of a better description, we can refer to the earliest anti-Hellenizing reaction among the Jews as the Zadokite movement: it began and ended during this period.

THE CHASIDIC PERIOD 175-145 B.C.E.

This period is best described as the "proto-Essenism" period. These thirty years were crucial for the formation of the ultimate Essene theology. The Chasids (Chasidim, Hasidaeans) came into existence about 175 B.C.E. and had split away from the more conservative Zadokites. These Chasids formed a fervent and militant organization dedicated to the establishment of a purified Judaism. The immediate objective was the total defeat of the Syrian Hellenizers and the Jewish apostates who cooperated with and supported them. For some reason, an extraordinary event seems to have occurred during the first decade of this period, without which there would probably never have been any Essene communion; the Chasidim split into two divisions, of which one remained in Judea while the other exiled itself, or was driven, into the Syrian desert, not far from Damascus, shortly before or about the year 170 B.C.E.

However, the evidence indicates also that these exiles returned soon after Mattathias and his sons wet up their standard at Modin in 167 B.C.E. During the struggle against the Syrians, the two fractions submerged their differences and became militant co-patriots. Precisely what Chasidic developments occurred from 160-145 B.C.E., remain obscure. However, we believe that the two divisions not only remained distinct but that the gulf between them probably deepened.

The thirty years following 175 B.C.E. were prolific in literary production. The oldest extant writing is the Damascus Document, composed before 170 B.C.E.. This was followed by the first portion of Enoch, to which is assigned the date 170-168 B.C.E. The third scripture consists of Chapters 7-12 of the canonical Daniel; this was not produced by the Essene movement proper, but by the more conservative Chasids, who never left Judea; the date is probably 164 B.C.E. The fourth scripture is the second portion of Enoch, composed about 162-161 B.C.E. The fifth work, The War of the Sons of Light, written about 163, is quite different. Following this, there seems to be a literary interruption, for no extant documents reflects a date following 160 and preceding 142 B.C.E.

ESSENISM AS A PUBLIC CULT 145-105 B.C.E.

About 145 B.C.E., as we learn from Josephus, the three great Jewish sects or political parties emerged as well-known and definite entities (Antiq., XIII, v9). The old right-wing Zadokites became the Sadducees; the more conservative wing of the Chasids emerged as the Pharisees; and the radical Chasids, the People of the Covenant, became the Essenes. Allegro states that from "the Pious Ones," or Hasidim...we can almost certainly trace the origins of the Essenes, and the Pharisees (Dead Sea Scrolls, p. 97). The Sadducees were rich, educated, successful, powerful Jews; and they absorbed the Epicurean philosophy. The Pharisees became the popular leaders of the people; in due course, they elaborated the Mosaic Law into an extraordinarily elaborate code; and they were probably influenced by the Stoic school of thought. The Essenes became more and more dedicated to the holy life of religious separation, which drew them finally into the Pythagorean way of life. The Essenes of 140 B.C.E. were quite different from the esoterics of 75 B.C.E., and even more from the rigid celibate-communists described by Philo, Pliny, and Josephus. One can, upon personal investigation, observe the gradual trajectory of their development way from traditional Judaism and toward a synthesis of Pythagorean-Buddhist-Iranian apocalyptic beliefs.

During and following the years beginning at 145 B.C.E., the People of the Covenant continued for some time as a public organization which required no novitiate or secret indoctrination and which lived a fairly conventional

existence. They developed a corpus of literature which gradually supplemented or supplanted the canonical; they had undoubtedly already revised the calendar. The revised calendar was probably one of the first Essene deviations from orthodox Judaism because the Damascus Document refers to The Book of the Divisions of the Times According To Their Jubilees and Their Weeks, which probably contained a system connected with their novel calendar (Larson, The Essene Heritage, p. 30). This calendar placed their feasts and holy days on date diverging from those celebrated by the orthodox; and, although we cannot be sure just when they ceased to offer burnt sacrifices, this deviation may have begun about 125-120 B.C.E., and it is certain that such ritual were proscribed when they became Pythagoreans (Ibid.). This conclusion is supported by the fact that Jubilees (140 B.C.E.) reflects the common practice of burnt sacrifices in many passages; but the Testaments (130-125 B.C.E.) has only a single reference to such a ritual (Levi 9). There is no reference at all to such sacrifices in the subsequent documents; and they are condemned in The Manual of Discipline (104 B.C.E.).

Although there was no new apocalypse, several scriptures of high order were produced during this period, probably including many of the Thanksgiving Psalms. To the great doctrinal composition known as the Book of Jubilees as well as the third portion of Enoch, we assign the approximate date of 140. The fourth major production is the substratum which constitutes the bulk of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, probably written about 130-125 B.C.E.

THE CELIBATE-COMMUNIST CULT EMERGES 105-60 B.C.E.

The continual evolution of the religious theology of the Essene cult, which began in 195 B.C.E., take a turn again before or about the year 105 B.C.E. This conclusion is reinforced by the fact that it was never necessary for the cult to discard or even to revise its own previous literature; and still more by the fact that modern scholarship has often failed to distinguish between pre- and post-Pythagorean documents among the Essene collection. We cannot know all the factors which brought about the transformation of a separatist movement within Judaism that ultimately culminated in a Pythagorean-Buddhist cult that elevated their own writings above the Tanakh, but we know that late in his career, John Hycranus ("the Wicked Priest") went over from the Pharisees to the Sadducees and began to persecute the Pharisees (Antiq., XIII, x, 5-6). Along with this he persecuted the dissident Essenes who were "super scrupulous Pharisees" in many regards and they suffered in double measure. We know that the Essenes gave allegiance to John Hycranus while he was opposed by Antiochus VII and when he assumed the triple crown (Prophet, Priest, King); but they must have turned against him during the cruel aggressions he perpetrated upon his neighbors after 125 B.C.E. And they would certainly never have condoned the savage sadism of Aristobulus I during his one year reign of terror.

Around 104 B.C.E. the Essenes established their headquarters at the Dead Sea; and we consider it certain that about this time they gravitated even more toward Pythagorean religious beliefs in rejection of the Temple cult and all that Judaism personified. Basically you, at this time, could consider them a Pythagorean mystery cult.

Some of the most influential and important scriptures date from this period! The Manual of Discipline summarizes the laws and organization of this Pythagorean Essenic cult. It contains a large amount of information that was apparently unknown to Philo Judeaus and even to Josephus. In this period also belongs possibly some of the most important literature of the Essene collection; ENOCH FOUR and FIVE, which reflect a totally altered social philosophy. The Habakkuk Commentary is very important, because of the story which details the Wicked Priest in Jerusalem (John Hycranus who usurped the position deserved by the Zadok priesthood) who, because of "the wrong done the teacher of righteousness and the men of the party, God delivered into the hands of his enemies." The final Essene composition, and perhaps the most important of all, consists of additions to the Testaments which re-create in vivid term the ministry, sacrificial death, resurrection, and ascent to heaven of the last Teacher of Righteousness.

THE LAST OF THE ESSENES 60 B.C.E. TO 70 A.D.

What is said next is very important that you understand. When the Essenes became known to Philo and Josephus, they had long been in their state of rigid maturity. Never has there existed a more secretive or

thoroughly disciplined organization. They expected their Messiah (Angel-Messiah) within two or three decades following 60 B.C.E.; and if so, they must have found means of rationalizing the delay in his coming after 30 B.C.E. Also, what had probably been intended as an interim or preparatory morality and organization became for them not only a permanent but also a highly desirable way of life. By selling all that they had and giving it to themselves collectively, by turning over to the Order all that they earned during many years of industry, and by living always in the strictest frugality, the members had made their community wealthy. The hope of a supernatural kingdom was, therefore, no longer the sole attraction: for the Society could practically guarantee life-long security from the ills and buffetings of a cruel and uncertain life.

While the Pharisees, who were already the rabbis of the Diaspora, assumed spiritual leadership over the scattered nation, the Essenes, like their opposites, the Sadducees, vanished as an independent cult; and there is evidence that soon after Christianity burst upon the Judean scene, a majority of the Holy Ones came over, forming the first Jerusalem Church; and then, after the destruction of the Jewish capital in 70 C.E., reorganized themselves into the Christian sect known as the Ebionites. (Larson, The Essene Heritage, p. 20-32).

THE INFLUENCE OF THE ESSENE LIBRARY

The collection of writing recovered in the Qumran environs has restored to us a voluminous corpus of Jewish documents dating from the third century B.C.E. to 68 C.E., demonstrating the rich literary activity of Second Temple-period Jewry. The collection comprises documents of a varied nature, most of them of a distinct religious bent outside what would be considered normative Judaism. The chief categories represented are:

- 1. Biblical
- 2. Apocryphal or pseudepigraphical
- 3. Sectarian writings.

The study of this original library has demonstrated that the boundaries between these categories is far from clear-cut. The biblical manuscripts include what are probably the earliest copies of these texts to have come down to us. Most of the books of the Bible are represented in the collection. Some books are extant in large number of copies; others are represented only fragmentarily on mere scraps of parchment. The biblical texts display considerable similarity to the standard Masoretic (received) text. This, however, is not always the rule, and many texts diverge from the Masoretic. This presents a serious problem for the Christian whether he knows of it or not. Analysis of these discrepancies yields more than simple alternate readings; we have divergent and conflicting theologies that confront us in such comparisons. We find readings that conflict theologically with the Received Masoretic Palestinian text and which substantiate the sect's unique theological persuasions as taken from the pagan religious mentioned above. In other words, we find variant readings where the Masoretic text has been changed to reflect the Essene's theology as it had evolved under Pythagorean, Buddhist, and Iranian influences. These changes began with the Essenes in Alexandria, Egypt, with the translation of the Jewish Scriptures into Greek; for it was then that such pagan religious concepts made their way into the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures. Copies of these altered Greek texts existed at Qumran alongside the Masoretic Jewish texts.

They disagreed theologically in no small way!

CONCLUSION

When reading the New Testament it must be kept in mind that what we are reading are the religious concepts of these Essenic believers which converted as a group to the Jesus Movement following the crucifixion of Jesus.

With them came their unique religious beliefs that had separated themselves from the Jewish mainstream. Many of their religious beliefs, affective everything from Messiah to salvation, can be found to be a compromise with normative Jewish teaching as coming from Moses and the Prophets. If one looks deeply then he finds what the facts show: that the Essenic religious beliefs of 30-70 C.E. are almost completely different from what the group in its inception in 170 B.C.E. held and cherished. In place of the fulfillment of the Torah and the Tanakh we find a unique synthesis of religious beliefs gathered from many pagan nations to which mention was made above. This unique synthesis had produced a unparalleled theology regarding their Angel-Messiah and his role in the redemption of mankind. Instead of preserving for mankind the truths concerning the Davidic Messiah promised by YHVH, we find a Pythagorean, Buddhist, Iranian, Egyptian, Greek, and Mithraic godman and these concepts were applied to Jesus by this group and their influence and legacy can be seen in writings of the New Testament which portray Jesus in such a manner. Your further study into this area is encouraged that you see these things for yourself. THE FACTS AWAIT YOUR DISCOVERY!

SUGGESTED BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bible Myths and Parallels In Other Religions by T. W. Doane
- Aryan Sun-Myths The Origin of Religion (1899) by Charles Morris
- The Paganism In Our Christianity by A. Weigall
- Forgery in Christianity by Joseph Wheless, Esq.
- Anacalypis by Godfrey Higgins Vol I and II
- The Mythology of the Aryan Nations by G.W. Cox
- The Mystery Religions and Christianity by S. Angus PhD
- The Book Your Church Dosen't Want You To Read; Tim C. Leedom Editor
- Ancient History of the God Jesus by E. Dujardin
- Antiquity Unveiled by J.M. Roberts, Esq.
- Apollonius the Nazarene by Raymond Bernard, PhD.
- A Short History Of the Bible by Bronson C. Keeler
- Christianity Before Christ by John. G. Jackson
- Christianity: The Last Great Creation of the Pagan World by Vernal Holley
- Isis Unveiled by Helena Blavatsky
- Deceptions and Myths of the Bible by Lloyd Graham
- Diegesis by Rev. R. Taylor
- Gnostic and Historic Christianity by Gerald Massey
- Pagan and Christian Creeds by Edward Carpenter
- Pagan Christs by J. M. Robertson
- Syntagma of the Evidences of the Christian Religion by Rev. R. Taylor
- The Devil's Pulpit or Astro-Theological Sermons by Rev. R. Taylor
- The Astrological Foundation of the Christ Myth by M. Jabbar
- Stellar Theology and Masonic Astronomy by R. H. Brown
- The Religions of Mankind, Their Origin and Development by Hans-Joachim Schoeps
- Egyptian Belief and Modern Thought by James Bonwick
- Lectures on the Origin of Religion by Max Muller
- Egyptian Mythology and Egyptian Christianity by Samuel Sharpe
- The Dead Sea Scrolls and The Christian Myth by John Allegro
- The Egyptian Book of the Dead by Gerald Massey
- The Great Myth Of The Sun-Gods by A.By. Kuhn, PhD
- The Gospels And The Gospel by G.R.S. Mead
- The Historical Jesus And The Mythical Christ by Gerald Massey
- The Origin and Evolution of Religion by Albert Churchward
- "The Truth About Jesus," lecture by M. Mangasarian
- The Woman's Dictionary of Symbols and Sacred Objects by Barbara Walker

The World's Sixteen Crucified Saviors by Kersey Graves

[BACK](#)



WHO ARE THE EBIONITES AND WHAT SHOULD THEY MEAN TO THE CHRISTIAN?

The doctrine of Trinity, which is one of the fundamental constituents of Christian dogma, was absent from Christianity during the lifetime of Jesus Christ. The maximum one can grant is that this doctrine started taking shape after the Crucifixion. It took many centuries for it to reach its final well-defined but inexplicable form. It went through a long process of extremely bitter and controversial debates between Christian theologians and philosophers representing different religious, cultural and traditional backgrounds.

It was greatly influenced by the myths and the traditions of various lands which hosted "Christianity" in its early period. The main stem of Christianity, however, which took care of and nurtured the development of "Christian beliefs" and philosophy in its early formative part was of Jewish stock. Jewish influence remained predominant throughout the early part of Christian history. The disciples of Jesus who learned and understood Christianity directly from Jesus and witnessed it in the form of his life, belonged to this stock. They were the primary custodians of Christianity with deeply embedded roots in the holy soil of Jesus' instructions and way of life. It was they who witnessed the Crucifixion and had seen Jesus after the crucifixion.

THE FIRST FOLLOWERS OF JESUS

Early Christians (Jew and Gentile) appear to have been fundamentally divided over both the nature of Jesus and whether to adhere to the Mosaic Law or not. In the second phase of Christian development (after 50 C.E.), St. Paul became the most pivotal character in giving Christianity a new philosophy and ideology. There were fundamental differences of opinion between Paul and James the Righteous. While James looked after the Jerusalem Church, Paul was preaching in the West, particularly to the Gentiles. The Western Church evolved along Pauline doctrinal lines, whereas the Church in Jerusalem developed along monotheistic teachings.

One offshoot of James' ministry were the Ebionites, a sect whose name derives from the Hebrew "ebionim" meaning 'the meek' or 'the poor'. They were the Jewish Christians, for whom Jesus took on the mantle of Messiah and not that of the 'Son of God'. They followed the Mosaic law with great zeal, and had their own "Gospel" known in various contexts as the 'Gospel of the Hebrews', 'Gospel of the Ebionites' or the 'Gospel of the Nazarenes'. Here is a description of the Ebionites drawn from various sources.

In his book The History of the Church written in the 4th century AD in Caesarea, Eusebius mentions the Ebionites in the book Vespasian to Trajan. Eusebius, the most renowned church historian, mocks the Ebionite views (remember he is a Gentile in the Western Church), saying that their name comes from their poor and mean opinion of Jesus. According to Eusebius, the Ebionites regarded Jesus as mortal (human and not divine) and esteemed him as righteous through the growth of his character. As Jews, the Ebionites observed the Sabbath; every detail of the Law, and did not accept the Pauline idea of salvation through faith alone. Eusebius also talks of another group of Ebionites who accepted the virgin birth and the Holy Spirit, but refused to accept Jesus' pre-existence as "God the Word and Wisdom". They followed a 'Gospel of the Hebrews' which could possibly have been St Matthew's Gospel (written in Hebrew but lost to us today). They observed the Sabbath and the Jewish system, but celebrated the resurrection.

In his book describing the background of the Ebionites, R Eisenman in The Dead Sea Scrolls Uncovered writes that James (the 'Zaddik' or 'Zadok', meaning Righteous) was the leader of the Jerusalem Church in the middle of the first century (40-60 AD approx.) The branch which was retrospectively called Jewish Christianity in Palestine. The Ebionites developed from this branch.

The Community who followed James were known as 'the Poor', (Galatians 2:10, James 2:3-5) a designation mentioned both in the Sermon on the Mount and in the Dead Sea Scrolls. In many ways, Eisenman feels that the Ebionites were similar to the authors of the Dead Sea Scrolls. They honored James the Righteous, and believed Jesus to be their mortal Messiah, while Paul had become an "Apostate from the Law". They observed the Law and the Sabbath with great zeal.

They held James in the highest regard, while Paul was considered 'The Enemy' as spoken and warned of by Yeshua (Matt 13:24-43):

Matt 13:24 (KJV) Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is likened unto a man which sowed good seed in his field: 25 But while men slept, his enemy came and sowed tares among the wheat, and went his way. 26 But when the blade was sprung up, and brought forth fruit, then appeared the tares also. 27 So the servants of the householder came and said unto him, Sir, didst not thou sow good seed in thy field? from whence then hath it tares? 28 He said unto them, An enemy hath done this. The servants said unto him, Wilt thou then that we go and gather them up? 29 But he said, Nay; lest while ye gather up the tares, ye root up also the wheat with them. 30 Let both grow together until the harvest: and in the time of harvest I will say to the reapers, Gather ye together first the tares, and bind them in bundles to burn them: but gather the wheat into my barn. 31 Another parable put he forth unto them, saying, The kingdom of heaven is like to a grain of mustard seed, which a man took, and sowed in his field: 32 Which indeed is the least of all seeds: but when it is grown, it is the greatest among herbs, and becometh a tree, so that the birds of the air come and lodge in the branches thereof. 33 Another parable spake he unto them; The kingdom of heaven is like unto leaven, which a woman took, and hid in three measures of meal, till the whole was leavened. {measures: the word in the Greek is a measure containing about a peck and a half, wanting a little more than a pint} 34 All these things spake Jesus unto the multitude in parables; and without a parable spake he not unto them: 35 That it might be fulfilled which was spoken by the prophet, saying, I will open my mouth in parables; I will utter things which have been kept secret from the foundation of the world. 36 Then Jesus sent the multitude away, and went into the house: and his disciples came unto him, saying, Declare unto us the parable of the tares of the field. 37 He answered and said unto them, He that soweth the good seed is the Son of man; 38 The field is the world; the good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked [one]; 39 The enemy that sowed them is the devil; the harvest is the end of the world; and the reapers are the angels. 40 As therefore the tares are gathered and burned in the fire; so shall it be in the end of this world. 41 The Son of man shall send forth his angels, and they shall gather out of his kingdom all things that offend, and them which do iniquity; {things...: or, scandals} 42 And shall cast them into a furnace of fire: there shall be wailing and gnashing of teeth. 43 Then shall the righteous shine forth as the sun in the kingdom of their Father. Who hath ears to hear, let him hear.

This idea of Paul is definitely different from the light of the redactionist history we find in the New Testament but ample evidence exists which throws a completely different light upon Paul and history. If you would like to see this for yourself it is detailed at our website: <http://faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>. Thus according to the Jewish Christians, or Yeshua's church, Paul was one who deviated from the Mosaic Laws and Commandments and was as far as they were concerned the "adversary" (devil). This may be hard for Christians to understand, yet believe considering what you have heard taught from pulpits Sunday through Sunday your whole life, but what you have heard does not change the facts that have surfaced from both archeology and in-depth Bible study as well as a detailed examination of the extra-biblical documents that exist today for your inspection. Somewhere you have to come to terms with James and the early church's view of Paul as handed down to us for those who wish to inquire. One cannot discount their extra-Biblical writings that have come down to us that severely impugn the "Gospel" Paul preached to Gentiles, and this explains his resentment to the apostles in Jerusalem as recorded in the epistles (reputed pillars...note the sarcasm in his tone when addressing the

leadership of Jesus' church).

According to Baigent, Leigh and Lincoln in The Messianic Legacy, the source of the original teachings of the Ebionites, Gnostics, Manicheans, Sabians, Mandeans, Nestorians and Elkasites has been described as the Nazarene philosophy. They refer to Nazarene thought as: 'An orientation towards Jesus and his teachings which derives ultimately from the original Nazarene position, as articulated by Jesus himself, then propagated by James, Jude or Judas Thomas and their immediate entourage.' Their beliefs were:

- strict adherence to the Mosaic Law
- recognition of Jesus as Messiah
- belief in the normal human birth of Jesus
- hostility towards Pauline views

There is a collection of Arabic manuscripts kept in a library in Istanbul which contains quotes from a 5th or 6th Century text ascribed to the 'al-nasara', written in Syriac and found in a monastery in Khuzistan in south-west Iran near the Iraq border. It reflects the views of the Nazarene hierarchy escaping from Jerusalem after the destruction in 66 AD. It refers to Jesus as a human being and stresses the Judaic Law (notice that this is the belief of the first century church and those closest to the historical Jesus).

The inescapable conclusion of the scrupulous student of history, language, and Scripture is that Paul's followers "abandoned the religion of Christ and turned towards the religious doctrines of the Romans."

Of all the various doctrines which evolved during the formative stages of Christianity, only those who believed in the Nazarene philosophy can justifiably be given preference. These early Christians were taught the meaning of Christianity by Jesus himself.

THE ROLE OF PAUL

From the time of St Paul onwards, as Christianity spread to alien lands and pagan faiths within the Roman Empire, it began to be powerfully influenced and bent by the cultures and mythologies prevalent in those lands and went further away from its nascent purity. St Paul did his bit in influencing the deterioration of the "original Christian thought" by introducing his own brand of mysticism. He was neither of Jewish stock nor did he have any direct contact with Jesus, except through his claimed vision. He was already, it seems, under the powerful influence of the alien cultures.

Apparently there were two options available to St Paul, either to fight the strenuous battles against a world of superstitions, myths and legends prevalent in the lands of the Roman Empire from times immemorial or to give in to them and let Christianity change to suit their requirements and ambitions. This gave the Gentiles the message that Christianity was not essentially different from their legends and myths. Paul only recast Judaism in terminology which was already familiar to the Gentile to whom he preached. Thus Paul found the adoption of the second option far more profitable and convenient and let Christianity change to suit the ambitions and philosophies popular in the gentile world.

This strategy worked well in as much as it gained a great number of converts to the new faith which otherwise would not have been easily available. But at what cost. Unfortunately, it ended up only in an unholy competition between noble Christian values and pagan myths. What St Paul changed was only the names of the pagan gods and replaced them with Jesus, God the Father and the Holy Ghost. It was not him in fact who invented the myth of Trinity and introduced it to the pagan world in the name of Christianity, on the contrary he borrowed the myth of the Trinity from pagan mythology and bonded it to Christianity. From then on it was the same old paganism but with new names and new faces.

Pauline Christianity, therefore, did not succeed in changing the doctrines, myths and superstitions of the pagan world but only ended in changing "original Christianity" (Messianic Judaism) in accordance with them. If the mountain did not respond to his call, he decided to go to the mountain.

THE REALITY OF A JEWISH JESUS

Of course it is anybody's prerogative to choose between Pauline Christianity and that of James the Righteous and other early leaders of Christianity who were the disciples of Jesus Christ himself. But here we want to establish the point that the main stock of Christianity continued to develop along Jewish lines and kept itself aloof from the later innovations which generated the rigmarole and complexities of Christian dogmas we see today for Gentile imaginations such as the godhead of Jesus as the Son, the Trinity, Inherited Sin, Redemption, the rejection and replacement of Israel by the church, etc. The views of the early leaders of the original Church, among whom James the Righteous is prominent, were simple and honest and had no internal contradictions or paradoxes hiding behind a smoke screen of mystery as we confront today in the Pauline churches of our land. A study of the history of Judaism in Christianity establishes beyond question the fact that the Unity of God, uncomplicated by the slogan of Trinity, remained the official doctrine of the true Church of Christ in its pristine purity. The faith of Yeshua was Jewish, is Jewish, and will always remain Jewish. It is us who need to reevaluate what we have been taught and believe in light of fact and reason.

Please remember that this short treatise is not an attempt to convert Christians to any faith other than that of the faith both held and practiced by Yeshua (Jesus). It is simply a genuine effort to invite the Christians back to the pure unadulterated faith and practice of Jesus himself. It is a sincere attempt to revert the fiction back to the facts of Christianity. Facts that are certainly as beautiful as they are realistic and satisfy both the head and the heart.

For almost two thousand years, it is not the legends woven around the reality of Jesus Christ that has kept Christianity together and has helped it to survive the challenges of reason and ever growing enlightenment borne out of scientific progress, nor is its survival due to the mystic belief of Trinity. What has held the truth and essence of Christianity together is the beauty of the person and the teachings of Jesus Christ. It is the divine conduct and not the divine person of Jesus that has been so beautiful to adhere to. It was the suffering, patience and perseverance for the sake of noble ideals and his bold upright rejection of all despotic attempts to make him change his principles that is the real backbone of Christianity. It is still as beautiful and as lovable today as it was ever before. It has influenced so powerfully the Christian minds and hearts that they remain bonded to Jesus.

His real greatness lies in the fact that he transcended and conquered the forces of darkness that had conspired to vanquish him despite being a frail human being and no more than a human being. That victory of Jesus is something to be shared with pride by the children of Adam. As we see it from the vantage point of in-depth scholarship, he is one of the most noble progeny of Adam who taught humanity by his example of perseverance in the face of extreme suffering and pain. Not to surrender but to remain steadfast in the teeth of extreme trial was the noblest achievement of Jesus. It was his life of suffering and pain that redeemed humanity and made him conquer death.

To share suffering in life is far better than to escape suffering through death. Hence the concept of the supreme sacrifice of Jesus is magnified not only by his death, but by his life lived in total obedience to his Father. Today, we Christians share in his grace.

The greatness of Jesus, we again insist, lay in his supreme sacrifice during his lifetime. All his life, he defied the temptations to compromise, give in and exchange a life of suffering with that of ease and comfort. The same cannot be said for Paul, when in-depth analysis of his teachings as paralleled with those of Jesus and Judaism often diverge. Day in, day out Yeshua confronted death but refused to give in and lived for the sake of the sinful to bring them to life. He conquered death not by surrendering himself to death, but by refusing to bow down to it. He defeated it roundly and emerged from its clutches where a lesser man would have perished. Thus he proved his truth and the truth of his word and message beyond a shadow of doubt. That is how we see Jesus and that is why we love him so. His voice was the voice of God and not the voice of his own ambitions. He said what he was commissioned to say, neither more nor less than what God had told him to say. He worshipped God throughout his life and worshipped Him alone and never did he require any mortal to worship or bow before

who are the ebionites and what should they mean to the christian?

himself or before his mother. This is the reality of Jesus to which we at Bet Emet Ministries invite the Christians of all denomination and faiths to return.



20% off on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: NF20



CLEMENT OF ALEXANDRIA

The following is a summary of information taken from the Catholic Encyclopedia, Volume IV, along with commentary. Properly his name is Titus Flavius Clemens (c. 150-215 AD), but he is known in church history by the former designation to distinguish him from Clement of Rome. Date of birth unknown; died about the year 215. St. Clement was an early Greek theologian and head of the catechetical school of Alexandria. Athens is given as the starting-point of his journeyings, and was probably his birthplace. He became a convert to the Faith and travelled from place to place in search of higher instruction, attaching himself successively to different masters: to a Greek of Ionia, to another of Magna Graecia, to a third of Coele-Syria, after all of whom he addressed himself in turn to an Egyptian, an Assyrian, and a converted Palestinian Jew. At last he met Pantaenus in Alexandria, and in his teaching "found rest".

THE ALEXANDRIAN INFLUENCE UPON CLEMENT AND HIS RELIGIOUS BELIEF SYSTEM

St. Clement of Alexandria was a convert to the Christian faith, through the direction of St. Pantaenus. He became St. Pantaenus's disciple and assistant at the Christian School of Alexandria. [This is where Clement would be influenced by the various theologies circling at Alexandria which lay the groundwork for his later "interpretation" of Jesus.](#) Under St. Pantaenus, he helped create the Coptic alphabet and translate Scripture into Coptic. Clement was a highly regarded philosopher, and he became St. Pantaenus's **successor to the School of Alexandria (before 190 AD)**. As a philosopher, and head of the Catechetical School in Alexandria, St. Clement of Alexandria is considered the **"father" of Christian philosophy**. Following earlier examples, like St. Justin Martyr, St. Clement saw the strength of philosophy, and believed God had inspired the Greeks with philosophy, to become a preparatory tool for Greeks for the Gospel. Through philosophy, he brought many other converts into Christianity, as well as strengthened the faith of those who were already Christians in Alexandria. His theology and philosophy delved into new areas for Christians, and so became the example to his successors of what Christian philosophers should be like, including his famous student, Origen. The philosophers were critics or eclectics, and Plato was the most favored of the old masters. Neo-Platonism, the philosophy of the new pagan renaissance, had a prophet at Alexandria in the person of Ammonius Saccas. Philo, their foremost thinker, became a sort of Jewish Plato.

The place of Alexandria itself was well chosen, not only because of the Essene influence but the **great library** that was there. It was natural that Christian speculation should have a home at **Alexandria**. This great city was at the time a centre of culture as well as of trade. Not to be underestimated is Alexandria and the religious center in which it functioned because of its unique location. Being a center for trade in the world at that time it served as a melting pot for all religious ideas; even more so because of the great library there as well as the university and the Essene influence with their university as well. This great university had grown up under the long-continued patronage of the State. **The intellectual temper of Alexandria was broad and tolerant, as became a city where so many races and their theologies mingled. Alexandria was also the center for the Essenes in Egypt.** [The influence of the Essenes and their theology would have a lasting impact upon Clement.](#) The Jews, the Hellenized Jews, along with the Essenes who were there in very large numbers breathed its liberal atmosphere, and **had assimilated secular culture along with its liberal religious beliefs of the day.** They there formed the most

enlightened colony of the Dispersion. **Having lost the use of Hebrew**, they found it necessary to translate the Scriptures into the more familiar Greek. Not being able to read Hebrew was a detriment of unparalleled portion as it made necessary the use of the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures. **This Septuagint became the Bible for the Jews in Alexandria as well as the Greek converts to the Christian faith. The Greek-Jewish Essenes who translated the Scriptures into Greek from Hebrew in the second century B.C.E. in Alexandria often inserted their own philosophies into the translation to promote their own particular theologies.** Christian Ginsburg details for us on page 32 of his monumental work The Essenes, Their History and Doctrines, that when these Greek-Jews of Alexandria were employed to translate the Prophets and the Psalms into Greek, that they availed themselves of the opportunity to introduce their tenants and rites into their version of the translation. This version is called the Septuagint and is a grossly mistranslated version of the Jewish Scriptures. Millions of Christians are not aware of this and many of the Christian scholars stop short to examine the evidence for themselves; simply they just don't know it happened. Not being able to read Hebrew for themselves, they accept the Greek translation bequeathed to them as if it came for G-d. Your evaluation of the facts concerning this translation will show you otherwise. C.D.F. Moule, in The Birth Of The New Testament, records for us on page 59 that the Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures is "a wildly inaccurate translation." Likewise, Lucetta Mowry, in The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Early Church, again tells us on page 11-12: "...the Qumran authors....altered the stories of the Pentateuch by pious and frequently fanciful embellishments. A more serious purpose of alteration was the attempt to use the stories as authoritative expression of the tenants of the Sect....rewriting familiar events of Israel's history and by inserting legendary details to make the Law of Moses correspond with Qumran thought. These documents, together with the commentaries, testify to the Sect's interest in supplementing biblical authority by adapting canonical works to its own purpose. The community desired in particular to prove that its members were the true heirs of Israel's tradition and that the promise of redemption revealed by G-d to the patriarchs and to Moses now belonged to their brotherhood." This is just the tip of the iceberg and you should understand that men like Clement, who grew up and was schooled in Alexandria, not only heard this Essene theology and their teachings on the Angel-Messiah, but their documents, even the Greek translation of the Jewish Bible had such tenants of the group included within it. This explains the natural tendency for these early Greek Fathers to accept and promote a theology that was in opposition to what the conservative Jews of Palestine believed as preserved in their Jewish Scriptures, which now read quite differently from the Greek translation of the Essenes in Alexandria.

Alexandria was, in addition, one of the chief seats of that peculiar mixed pagan and Christian speculation known as Gnosticism. Basilides and Valentinus taught there. It is no matter of surprise, therefore, to find some of the Christians affected in turn by the scientific spirit. At an uncertain date, in the latter half of the second century, "a school of oral instruction" was founded. Lectures were given to which pagan hearers were admitted, and advanced teaching to Christians separately. It was an official institution of the Church. Pantaenus is the earliest teacher whose name has been preserved. As stated earlier, Clement first assisted and then succeeded Pantaenus in the direction of the school, about A.D. 190. He was already known as a Christian writer before the days of Pope Victor (188-199). These facts are very important as they explain how "pagan ideas" and parts of various "pagan religious belief systems" would be mixed into the overall scheme of Clement's theology. These ideas are read today in his writings as if they are G-d sent. Of most importance is the influence of Alexandria, and its university which served as a cauldron for the tolerant acquisition of various theologies. You need to be aware that this fact is of major importance in his ideas concerning the **Angel-Messiah** and his legacy of writings left to us where Jesus is read as if a g-d. **It was at Alexandria where this concept of the Angel-Messiah thrived.** Coupled with that fact that many scholars regard Clement as the founder of the Alexandrian school of theology, which emphasized the divine nature of Christ, **one quickly can see how the "human Messiah" of Judaism is fused with the "cosmic divine g-dman from Essene solar myths"** which were held strongly by the Phytagorean-Buddhist Greek Jews of Alexandria. Needles to say Clement, being a pagan before his conversion, was already familiar with such concepts and it is one short step to connecting such ideas with a "crucified Rabbi named Yeshua." It was Alexandrian theologians such as Saint Cyril and Saint Athanasius who took the lead in opposing **Adoptionism** and Nestorianism. Understand that Adoptionism was the earliest belief concerning Jesus as held by the Jews who knew him and followed him. This "truth," as earlier held by the **Ebionites** for that matter, would later be lost under the influence of the preaching of such men like St. Clement, St. Cyril, and **St. Athanasius**. Today Gentile Christianity is steeped in idolatry because of it.

St. Clement's understanding of Scripture was that it was filled with many layers of knowledge, and saw the need for an **allegorical or spiritual level of understanding, above and beyond its literal level**. This is just the opposite of how the Rabbis taught Scripture was to be interpreted! Clement is recorded in his writings his belief that the Holy Spirit, in directing the creation of Scripture, inspired the deeper meanings, to further inspire Christians to continue to search and learn from its many depths. He believed Scripture was also written in this manner, so as to confound those who would otherwise try to abuse it, because it would therefore require the unity of the faith to protect and guard true understanding of Scripture. "Wherefore the holy mysteries of the prophecies are veiled in the parables-- preserved for chosen men, selected to knowledge in consequence of their faith..." (St. Clement of Alexandria, Stromata 6:15).

Thus you can understand why scholars have found it no easy task to sum up the chief points of Clement's teaching. His writings lack technical precision and make no pretense to orderly exposition. As if his allegorical method of interpretation over the literal was not enough, he admitted the authority of the Church's tradition. He would be, first of all, a Christian, accepting "the ecclesiastical rule", but he would also strive to remain a philosopher, and bring his reason to bear in matters of religion. "Few are they", he said, "who have taken the spoils of the Egyptians, and made of them the furniture of the Tabernacle." You should ask yourself if such a methodology was wise! **This quote alone betrays the Egyptian-Christian synthesis of ideas to be found in his interpretation of the Christian faith**. He set himself, therefore, with philosophy as an instrument, to transform faith into science, and revelation into theology. In closing, **he misused the text by his faulty exegesis**. Unfortunately, he interpreted the Scripture after the manner of Philo. He was ready to find allegory everywhere. The facts of the Old Testament became mere symbols to him. Such hermeneutics and method of interpretation did great damage to the "truth" let alone the proper interpretation of the Scriptural texts. This does not even take into account the "fraudulent Greek text" which was in used in Alexandria in the days of Clement.

The bottom line is that the Alexandrian influence upon Clement, coupled with a "wildly inaccurate Greek translation of the Jewish Scriptures, moved the blossoming Christian Church further away from the truths of the earliest followers of Jesus.



ST. ATHANASIUS

Athanasius, often called Athanasius, Saint (circa 293-373), was a Christian theologian and bishop as well as a Doctor of the Church, who championed the cause of Christian theology (orthodoxy) in the 4th-century struggle against Arianism. Born in **Alexandria**, Egypt, Athanasius received a classical education before **entering the famous theological school of his native city**. He was ordained a deacon as a young man and served as secretary to the bishop of Alexandria. It was then that he began to take a prominent position in the great theological struggle that culminated in the Council of Nicaea in 325. At Nicaea, Athanasius opposed Arius, the Alexandrian priest who advanced the doctrine known as Arianism; his life is intimately connected with the progress of the Arian controversy, and he was by far the most formidable antagonist encountered by that heresy. Athanasius formulated the homoousian doctrine, according to which the Son of God is of the same essence, or substance, as the Father; Arius, on the other hand, maintained that the Son was of a different substance from that of the Father and was merely a creature, much more perfect than any other creature, who was used by God in subsequent works of creation. **Athanasius became bishop of Alexandria around 328 A.D.** During the Arian controversy, politics mingled with theology, and each side labored to win the favor of the Roman emperor Constantine the Great. The Arian Party was both influential and very active at the imperial court. Athanasius was exiled five times; more than one-third of his episcopate was spent away from his see. His fifth and final exile lasted only four months and ended in 364. He spent the rest of his life in quiet labor at his post in Alexandria.

What I wish to bring to your attention is that he, like many others, was educated at Alexandria where he came in contact with many theological ideas which conflicted with the Jewish belief; especially concerning the Messiah.



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE IMMACULATE CONCEPTION...TRUTH...OR SUN-MYTH RETOLD?

Much of the life Jesus Christ, as recorded in the New Testament, are nothing more than allegorical representations of the Sun God. Long before Jesus the Ancients formulated their Mythology (Religion), after the Image of Astronomical Phenomena. They saw this as the best way to connect with the Creator God, that is by patterning their religious rituals in accordance with the most visible and observable aspect of God's creation, the Cosmos. Many of the stories and accounts in the life of Jesus in the New Testament are actually various dramas (metaphorical representations) of Solar Mythology. We are presently focusing on the Solar-Lunar aspects of ancient mythology and modern religion. We shall at this point commence a dissection of the New Testament gospels. As done previously, I wish to evaluate the most salient and popular episodes within these scriptures and show their parallel to the lives of the other mythical saviors that we have already discussed. **And we will illustrate that much within the Gospels are analogous to Solar Mythology.** Let me say this is done only to separate the lies and falsehoods from the truth about Jesus so those who follow him and his example can do so in truth.

First, we have the miraculous conception of a virgin.

Mat 1:18 Now the birth of Jesus Christ was on this wise: When as his mother Mary was espoused to Joseph, before they came together, she was found with child of the Holy Ghost.

Mat 1:19 Then Joseph her husband, being a just man, and not willing to make her a public example, was minded to put her away privily.

Mat 1:20 But while he thought on these things, behold, the angel of the Lord appeared unto him in a dream, saying, Joseph, thou son of David, fear not to take unto thee Mary thy wife: for that which is conceived in her is of the Holy Ghost.

Mat 1:21 And she shall bring forth a son, and thou shalt call his name JESUS: for he shall save his people from their sins.

Mat 1:22 Now all this was done, that it might be fulfilled which was spoken of the Lord by the prophet, saying,

Mat 1:23 Behold, a virgin shall be with child, and shall bring forth a son, and they shall call his name Emmanuel, which being interpreted is, God with us.

THE ASTRONOMICAL ANALOGY

The astronomical explanation of the first three points is as follows, The Miraculous Conception, as I explained in a previous article, refers to the Conjugation (Conception) that annually takes place at the vernal equinox. God, the Father, the Sun personified, at this time (the vernal equinox) is joined (the crossing of the celestial equator and the ecliptic of the sun) to commence the Gestation of the Son (Sun) of God (Father Sun), that will be born 280 days later on December 25th.

The ancients felt that an offspring of a god, a son of god, should have a purer maternal origin than mortals, and this was evidence of his supernatural or divine origin. A man, even if he were thought of as a god, had to be born of a woman, and this could not be concealed, but paternal parentage is never so obvious, being known only to the mother, if anyone.

The purity of his maternal parentage required these Gentile Saviors to be born of a pure woman—a maiden. Hence, the Gentile saviours often were born of virgins and this "concept" continued even for the Gentile redactors of the New Testament. Besides normal conception ordinary birth was also too ignominious for a god. It had to be spotless, or immaculate. Jesus Christ in an apocryphal gospel, like Chrishna was born through his mother's side, rather than the impure route. Though not in the canonical works, some of the Christian fathers endorsed this story. I have even read Catholic dogma where it testifies that Jesus was born not through Mary's vagina, the normal birth canal, but through her navel!

Not only saviours but famous men, like Plato, Pythagoras, Alexander, Augustus and others, were thought to have been born miraculously. Plato was born of Paretonia, begotten of Apollo, not Ariston, his father, according to one authority.

The doctrine of immaculate conception is ancient but the manner of the holy conception was different in different countries. Zoroaster was immaculately conceived by a ray from the Divine Reason or Word and this was adopted by medieval artists.

But the idea of being overshadowed by the Holy Ghost seems to have been most current. God, the father of a god was believed to overshadow the mother of a god, to impregnate her. In 550 BC, Pythais, the mother of Pythagoras, conceived by a spectre or ghost of the god Apollo, the Sun-god.

Answer for yourself: Does the ghost of the sun god differ in principle from the Christian Holy Ghost?.

Juno of Rome grew pregnant at the touch of a flower to give birth to Mars. No impregnation could have been purer. So the most immaculate conception of all was that of the god of War! If it sounds absurd, how is it more senseless than conception by a ghost? Botany has shown that, at least, a flower can fertilize other flowers but no science has yet investigated the virility of ghosts.

The Greek Juno, Hera, was immaculately impregnated by the wind to give birth to Vulcan. Here is a close parallel indeed for the word habitually translated as spirit or ghost in the scriptures and continued into the Greek of the New Testament really means breath or wind! So literally the virgin Mary was impregnated by the wind just like Hera. The author of the Perennial Calendar tells us the miraculous conception of Juno Jugulis, the blessed virgin queen of heaven, fell on the second of February, the day of the early Christian festival of the date of the conception of the ever Blessed Virgin Mary.

A Chinese sect worshiped a saviour known as Xaca, who was conceived of his mother, Maia, by a white elephant, which she saw in her sleep, and for greater purity, she brought him forth from one of her sides. In Chinese popular religion, the virgin mother Shing-Mon gave birth to the God Yu from a conception by a water lily. The procreative refinement evinced here is equal to that of Juno. In another story Yu was conceived of a star!

Tamerlane's mother conceived having had sexual intercourse with the god of Day. The mother of Ghengis Khan, being too modest to claim that she was the mother of the son of God, said only that he was the son of the sun.

Osiris of Egypt and even Julius Caesar were immaculately conceived—the latter being the son of the beautiful virgin Cronis Celestine, and begotten by the Father of all Gods, Jupiter. His heir and nephew, Augustus Caesar, was curiously his half brother, as another son of Jove, by whose divine lust he was immaculately conceived in the temple of Apollo.

Both **Buddha and Chrishna**, of India, were immaculately conceived. The mother of Chrishna was overshadowed by the supreme God, Brahma, and the Holy Ghost was Naraan. Chrishna's mother had given birth seven times previously but remained a virgin. Philostratus, a disciple of Apollonius of Cappadocia, who was contemporary with Jesus Christ, tells that **Damis, the mother of Apollonius**, gave birth to this god and rival saviour of Jesus Christ, by being overshadowed by the god, **Proteus**.

Several of the virgin mothers of gods and great men go ten months between conception and delivery.

Plainly the tradition of the miraculous conceptions of gods, sons of gods, saviours and messiahs was prevalent in the world from ancient times on, beginning long before the mother of **Jesus** was overshadowed by the ghostly representative of the Most High. The belief in immaculate conception extended to every nation in the world. Grote, referring to Greece, declares that the furtive pregnancy of young women, often by a god, is one of the most frequently recurring incidents in the legendary narratives of the country.

Both the prevalence and antiquity of the idea of immaculate conception among the heathen is conceded by earlier Christian writers in their arguments from precedents of the divinity of Christ. St. Augustine, Origen and Lactanius tried to persuade us of the immaculate virginity of the mother of Jesus Christ by the example of similar pagan events. **The doctrine of immaculate conception is, then, conceded as long anterior to Christ and therefore not unique in his case.**

PROBLEMS WITH THIS DOCTRINE

- The gospels show that Christ himself did not claim to have a miraculous birth. He did not once allude to it, though as the principal evidence of his divinity, as Christians claim, he would have done so.
- His paternal genealogy, as made out by Matthew and Luke, completely confounds his virgin birth. They both trace his lineage through Joseph, which they could only do if Joseph was his father.
- His own disciple, Philip, declared him to be the son of Joseph, and several texts show that it was the original belief.
- The story of the virgin birth rests on the slender foundations of an angel and a dream. Mary got it by an angel, and Joseph by a dream, and thereby we have the whole of the story of the divinity of Jesus Christ.
- However, we have neither Joseph's nor Mary's report of these things, but only Matthew and Luke's. We do not know that either of them ever saw or spoke with Joseph or Mary on the subject.
- If Christ were a miraculously born god, would his mother would have reproved him for misconduct when she found him in the temple, as she, if no one else, must have known his nature?
- If Mary conceived miraculously, why was it kept so long from Joseph? Did the concubine of God intend to deceive her lawful husband? An angel had to be sent from heaven to let him into the secret.
- Why did not God inform Joseph by *inspiration* instead of using the round about way of sending an angel to do it?
- *Mary was found with child of the Holy Ghost*, but as we are told nothing more about the circumstances, does it not leave us suspicious?
- Since it all seems to have been based on dreams, was carried on through dreams, and has no better foundation than dreams, why should we give it better credit than similar stories found in heathen mythology? Or is it that Gentile Christianity is just a dreamy religion?
- In an educated and scientific age, should we accept reports of the birth of a God based on no better a foundation than dreams, angels and the legends of oriental mythology? In particular, can any scientist entertain the idea of infinite beings, themselves mere conjecture, actually impregnating human females?
- Ancient Eastern belief was that sexual intercourse was sinful, procreation was impure and human children were born thus contaminated. Human beings were imperfect and any god sent into the world as a saviour had to avoid such contamination. The solution was that incarnate gods entered the world through human virgins to avoid the impurity and the slander that the saviour might have arisen in more normal ways if the mother were not a virgin. Can any unbiased deny that this is the source of the origin of the story of Christ's virgin birth?
- If Christ had to come into the world avoiding the impurity of human conception and birth, why did he not

descend directly from heaven in person? If he can descend on the clouds at his—still awaited—second advent, why could he not do the same at his first advent, thereby pre-empting reasons for doubt and saving far more of fallen humanity?

- **Could anyone, free of religious guilt and indoctrination, presented with these stories as the truth today, willingly and joyfully accept them as proof that someone was a god? Or would they consider them to be fraudulent inventions, intended to gull the credulous?**
- **If you have never taken the time as a Christian to study the origins of your faith I highly suggest it. If you would only familiarize yourself with the Council of Nicea in 325 A.D. one can quickly see how under the influence of Constantine, a Sun-worshipper, that in the conversion of the Empire to the Christian faith then its leader, Jesus, had to be moulded into the image of prior Sun-gods. Such was Constantine's wish and whatever the emperor desired was done or else. Check it out!**

Answer for yourself: Does this event as depicted in the New Testament now seem "Divine and unique" to you any longer?



JESUS CHRIST AS THE CREATOR...TRUTH...OR SUN-MYTH RETOLD?

Christian dogma teaches that it was not "God the Father, but "God the Son" who created the heavens, the earth, and all that therein is.

The writer of the fourth Gospel says:

"All things were made by him, and without him was not anything made that was made" (John. 1:8).

Again:

"He was in the world, and the world was made by him, and the world knew him not" (John 1:10).

Again we can read many passages indicating the same...that creation was the work of the "Son of God and not God the Father":

Heb 1:2 2 Hath in these last days spoken unto us by his Son, whom he hath appointed heir of all things, by whom also he made the worlds; (KJV)

Eph 3:9 9 And to make all men see what is the fellowship of the mystery, which from the beginning of the world hath been hid in God, who created all things by Jesus Christ: (KJV)

Col 1:15-17 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: 16 For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: 17 And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. (KJV)

Samuel Johnson, D. O. Allen (Allen's India, pp. 137 & 380), and Thomas Maurice (Indian Antiquities, vol. ii. p. 288), tell us that, according to the religion of the Hindoos, it is Chrishna, the Son, and the second person in the ever-blessed Trinity, "who is the origin and the end of all the worlds; **all this universe came into being through him, the eternal maker**" (Oriental Religions, p. 502).

In the holy book of the Hindoos, called the Bhagvat Geeta, may be found the following words of Chrishna, address to his "beloved disciple" Ar-jouran:

"I am the **Lord of all created things**" (Lecture iv. p. 51). "Mankind was created by me of four kinds, distinct in their principles, and in their duties; know me then to be the Creator of mankind, uncreated, and without decay" (Geeta, p. 52).

In Lecture VII, entitled: "Of the Principles of Nature, and the Vital Spirit," he also says:

"I am the creation and the dissolution of the whole universe. There is not anything greater than I, and all things

hang on me."

Again in Lecture LX., entitled, "Of the Chief of Secrets and Prince of Science," Chrishna says:

"The whole world was spread abroad by me in my invisible form. All things are dependent on me." "I am the Father and the Other of this world, the Grandsire and the Preserver. I am the Holy One worthy to be known; the mystic figure O.M. (the Hindoo ineffable name and the mystic emblem of deity which is never uttered aloud, but only mentally by the devout....it signifies Brahma, Vishnou, and Siva, the Hindoo Trinity).I am the journey of the good: the Comforter; the Creator; the Witness; the Resting-place; the Asylum and the Friend" (Geeta, p. 80).

In Lecture X., entitled, "Of the diversity of the Divine Nature," he says:

"I am the Creator of all things, and all things proceed from me. Those who are endured with spiritual wisdom, believe this and worship me; their very hearts and minds are in me; they rejoice amongst themselves and delight in speaking of my name, and teaching one another my doctrine" (Geeta, p. 84).

Innumerable texts, similar to these, might be produced from the Hindoo Scriptures, but these are sufficient to show, in the words of Samuel Johnson quoted above, that, "According to the religion of the Hindoos, it is Chrishna who is the origin and the end of all the worlds;" and that "all this universe came into being through him, the Eternal Maker."

The Chinese believed in One Supreme God, to whose honor they burnt incense, but of whom they had no image. This "God the Father" was NOT the Creator, according to their theology or mythology; but they had another g-d, of whom they had statues or idols, called Natigai, who was the g-d of all terrestrial things; in fact, God, the Creator of this world which was inferior or subordinate to the Supreme Being from whom they petition for fine weather, or whatever else they want. He was their mediator.

According to ancient Persian mythology, there is one supreme essence, invisible and incomprehensible, named "Zeruane Akerene," which signifies "unlimited time," or "the eternal." From him emanated Ormuzd, the "King of Light," the "First-born of the Eternal One," etc. Now, this "First-born of the Eternal One" is he by whom all things were made, all things came into being through him; he is the Creator.

A large portion of the Zend-Avesta, the Persian Sacred Book or Bible, is filled with prayers to Ormuzd, God's First-Born. Let us look at just a couple of examples:

"I address my prayer to Ormuzd, Creator of all things; who always has been, who is, and who will be forever; ..."

"O Creator, I obey thy laws..."

The writer of the Gospel of John copies the same invocation as you can see in the following where he says that Jesus taught that prayers are to be offered in his name as was the pattern of Sun-worship above.

John 14:13 13 And whatsoever ye shall ask in my name, that will I do, that the Father may be glorified in the Son. (KJV)

YET THIS IS A DIRECT CONTRADICTION OF THE TEACHINGS OF JESUS:

Luke 11:1-2 1 And it came to pass, that, as he was praying in a certain place, when he ceased, one of his disciples said unto him, Lord, teach us to pray, as John also taught his disciples. 2 And he said unto them, When ye pray, say, Our Father which art in heaven, Hallowed be thy name. Thy kingdom come. Thy will be done, as in heaven, so in earth. (KJV)

According to the religion of the ancient Assyrians, it was Marduk, the Logos, the Word, "the eldest son of Hea," "the Merciful One," "the Life-giver," etc., who created the heavens, the earth, and all that therein is (Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, p. 404).

Adonis, the Lord and Savior, was believed to be the Creator of men, and g-d of the resurrection of the dead (Dunlap, Mysteries of Adoni, p. 156).

Prometheus, the Crucified Savior, is the divine forethought, existing before the souls of men, and the creator Hominium (Ibid., p. 156).

The writer of "The Gospel according to St. John," has made Christ Jesus co-eternal with God, as well as Creator, in these words:

"In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God". "The same was in the beginning with God" (John 1:1-2).

Again, in praying to his Father, he makes Jesus say:

"And now, O father, glorify thou me with thine own self with the glory which I had with thee before the world was" (John 14:5).

Paul is made to say:

Col 1:15-17 15 Who is the image of the invisible God, the firstborn of every creature: 16 For by him were all things created, that are in heaven, and that are in earth, visible and invisible, whether they be thrones, or dominions, or principalities, or powers: all things were created by him, and for him: 17 And he is before all things, and by him all things consist. (KJV)

Again:

"Jesus Christ, the same yesterday , to-day, and forever" (Heb. 13:8).

St. John the Divine, in his "Revelation," has made Christ Jesus say:

"I am the Alpha and Omega, the beginning and the end"... "which is, and which was, and which is to come, the Almighty" (Rev. 1:8, 22, 13).... "the first and the last" (Rev. 1:17, Rev. 12:13).

Hondoo Scripture also makes Chrishna "the first and the last," "the beginning and the end." We read in the Geeta, where Chrishna is reported to have said:

"I myself never was not" (Geeta, p. 35). "Learn that he by whom all things were formed " (meaning himself) "is incorruptible" (Geeta, p. 36). "I am eternity and non-eternity" (Lecture IX, p 89). "I am before all things, and the mighty ruler of the universe" (Lecture X. p. 83). " I am the beginning, the middle, and the end of all things" (Lecture X, p. 85).

Ar-jouan, his disciple, address him thus:

"Thou are the Supreme Being, incorruptible, worthy to be known; thou are prime supporter of the universal orb; thou art the never-failing and eternal guardian of religion; thou art from all beginning, and I esteem thee" (Lecture IX. p. 91). "Thou art "the Divine Being, before all other g-ds" (Lecture X. p. 84).

In another Holy Book of the Hindoos, called Vishnu Purana, we also read that Vishnu, in the form of Chrishna, "who descended into the womb of the (virgin) Devaki, and was born as her son" was "without beginning, middle, or end" (Vishnu Purana, p. 440).

Buddha is also Alpha and Omega, without beginning or end, "The Lord," "the Possessor of All," "He who is Omnipotent and Everlastingly to be Contemplated," "the Supreme Being, the Eternal One."

Lao-Kiun, the Chinese virgin-born God, who came upon earth about six hundred years before Jesus, was without beginning. It was said that he had existed from all eternity (Prog. of Relig. Ideas, vol. i. p. 200).

According to the Zend Avesta, Ormuzd, the first-born of the Eternal One, is he "who is, always has been, and who will be forever" (Prog. Relig. Ideas, vol. ii. p. 207).

Zeus was Alpha and Omega. an Orphic lines runs thus:

"Zeus is the beginning, Zeus the middle, out of Zeus all things have been made" (Muller, Chips, vol. ii. p. 15).

Bacchus, was without beginning or end. An inscriptions on an ancient medal, referring to him, reads thus:

"It is I who leads you; it is I who protects you, and who saves you. I am Alpha and Omega."

Beneath this inscription is a serpent with his tail in his mouth, thus forming a circle, which was an emblem of eternity among the ancients.

Without enumerating them, we can from the evidence say that the majority of the virgin-born gods were like Christ Jesus...without beginning or end..and that many of them were considered Creators of all things. This has led M. Dridon to remark (Hist. de. Dieu) that in early works of art, Christ Jesus is made to take the place of the Father in creation and in similar labors, just as in heathen religions an inferior deity does the work under a superior one.

Now this Redeemer and Savior was, as you have seen, the Sun, and Prof. Max Muller tells us that in the Vedic mythology, the Sun is not the being Deva only, "who performs his daily task in the sky, but he is supposed to perform much greater work. He is looked upon, in fact, as the Ruler, as the Establisher, and the Creator of the World " (Muller, Origin of Religions, p. 264).

Having been invoked as the "Life-bringer," the Sun is also called, in the Rig Veda, "the Breath of Life of all that move and rest;" and lastly he becomes "The Maker of all things," by whom all the worlds have been brought together (Muller, Origins of Religions, p. 268).

There is a prayer in the Vedas, called "Gayatree," which consists of three measured lines, and is considered the holiest and most efficacious of all their religious forms. Sir William Jones translated it thus:

"Let us adore the supremacy of that spiritual Sun, the g-dhead, who illuminates all, who re-creates all, from whom all proceed, to whom all must return; whom we invoke to direct our undertakings aright in our progress toward his holy seat."

With Seneca (a Roman philosopher, born at Cordova, Spain, 61 B.C.) then we can say:

"You may call the Creator of all things by different names (Bacchus, Hercules, Mercury, etc.), but they are only different names of the same divine being, the Sun."

Now we find the exact same things said about Jesus in the New Testament as its writers attribute "creation" to the Son of the Sun; to Jesus:

Again, we have the "pattern" of Sun-worship reapplied to the life of a Jewish Rabbi and hoped for Messiah by the Gentile Church....Judaism, the faith of Jesus, teaches monothesiem and that

all things were created by God the Father only:

Gen 1:1 1 In the beginning God created the heaven and the earth. (KJV)

Gen 1:21 21 And God created great whales, and every living creature that moveth, which the waters brought forth abundantly, after their kind, and every winged fowl after his kind: and God saw that it was good. (KJV)

Gen 1:27 27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. (KJV)

Gen 1:27 27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them.

Gen 1:27 27 So God created man in his own image, in the image of God created he him; male and female created he them. (KJV)

Gen. 2:3 3 And God blessed the seventh day, and sanctified it: because that in it he had rested from all his work which God created and made. (KJV)

Gen 2:4 4 These are the generations of the heavens and of the earth when they were created, in the day that the LORD God made the earth and the heavens, (KJV)

Gen 5:1 1 This is the book of the generations of Adam. In the day that God created man, in the likeness of God made he him; (KJV)

Gen 5:2 2 Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. (KJV)

Gen 5:2 2 Male and female created he them; and blessed them, and called their name Adam, in the day when they were created. (KJV)

Gen 6:7 7 And the LORD said, I will destroy man whom I have created from the face of the earth; both man, and beast, and the creeping thing, and the fowls of the air; for it repenteth me that I have made them. (KJV)

Deut 4:32 32 For ask now of the days that are past, which were before thee, since the day that God created man upon the earth, and ask from the one side of heaven unto the other, whether there hath been any such thing as this great thing is, or hath been heard like it? (KJV)

As if you didn't notice God existed long before the "sun" which He created later:

Gen 1:14-19 14 And God said, Let there be lights in the firmament of the heaven to divide the day from the night; and let them be for signs, and for seasons, and for days, and years: 15 And let them be for lights in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth: and it was so. 16 And God made two great lights; the greater light to rule the day, and the lesser light to rule the night: he made the stars also. 17 And God set them in the firmament of the heaven to give light upon the earth, 18 And to rule over the day and over the night, and to divide the light from the darkness: and God saw that it was good. 19 And the evening and the morning were the fourth day. (KJV)

But primitive man, knowing God through what he could only see, fashioned myths and beliefs involving the cosmos to explain to himself the God he could not see, and we have this legacy in the Roman New Testament in which we are lead to believe as did the ancients that "Sun became the Son."



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



CONTRASTING THE CRUCIFIXION OF SUN-GODS WITH THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND IMPLICATIONS FOR ATONEMENT

[EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO PRIOR CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #1](#)

[EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO PRIOR CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #2](#)

[EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO PRIOR CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #3](#)

[EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO PRIOR CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #4](#)

[EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO PRIOR CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #5](#)

[EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO PRIOR CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #6](#)

IMPORTANT THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS THAT EVERY CHRISTIAN OUGHT TO KNOW

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #1](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #2](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #3](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #4](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #5](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #6](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #7](#)

[THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #8](#)

bennoah1@airmail.net

contrasting the crucifixion of sun gods with the crucifixion of jesus and its implicationf for atonement





JESUS CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL ...TRUTH...OR A SUN-MYTH RETOLD?

The doctrine of Christ Jesus' descent into hell is emphatically part of the Christian belief, although not alluded to by Christian divines excepting when unavoidable. In the first place, it is taught in the Creed of the Christian Church.

The Nicene Creed was created at the Synod at Nicea in 325 A.D. and set forth this Creed: We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, maker of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, the only-begotten of his Father, of the substance of the Father, God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, being of one substance with the Father. By whom all things were made, both which be in heaven and in earth. Who for us men and for our salvation came down [from heaven] and was incarnate and was made man. He suffered and the third day he rose again, and ascended into heaven. And he shall come again to judge both the quick and the dead. And [we believe] in the Holy Ghost. And whosoever shall say that there was a time when the Son of God was not, or that before he was begotten he was not, or that he was made of things that were not, or that he is of a different substance or essence [from the Father] or that he is a creature, or subject to change or conversion--all that so say, the Catholic and Apostolic Church anathematizes them (From The Seven Ecumenical Councils, ed. H. Percival, in the Library of Nicene and Post Nicene Fathers, 2nd series (New York: Charles Scribners, 1990), Vol XIV, 3).

Notice if you will the "third day" portion; this is a clear reference to the New Testament doctrine of Jesus' descent into hell prior to the resurrection.

The gospels pretend to be matter of fact stories of some events in the life of the Christian God. The various "Creeds" reflect such a story. They tell what people saw or heard. They claim they saw Jesus rise to heaven, but it is difficult to know how they could have known he descended to hell, unless they simply had the risen Jesus confessing it in one of his mysterious post mortem appearances. Anyway, it was not expressly written into the gospels. Nevertheless, it became and remains a firm belief among Christians that Jesus did descend to Hell. A Christian writer explains that the early Christians were united on the doctrine of Christ's underground mission. It was too well settled to admit of dispute

The Apostles' Creed teaches the doctrine explicitly and it was once thought of as equal in authority to the gospels, being supposedly written by the apostles themselves.

The New Testament attests to this as well: Peter (**1 Peter 3:18**) is thought to be referring to the descent into Hell when he writes: **being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit, by which also he went and preached unto the spirits in prison.** Prison must mean Hell.

In Acts 2:31 we find that his soul was not left in hell. The writer plainly considered Jesus's soul had been there. The most positive declaration that Christ did descend into hell could not make it more certainly a scriptural Christian doctrine.

WHERE DID SUCH A BELIEF ARISE?

Answer for yourself: Where then did such a belief arise?

You need to know that the most important event in the lives of Pagan Saviours, after their crucifixion, is that of their descent into the infernal regions. In the Hindu bible, written more than three thousand years ago, the Saviour Krishna:

...went down to hell to preach to the inmates of that dark and dreary prison, with the view of reforming them, and getting them back to heaven, and was willing himself to suffer to abridge the period of their torment.

Elsewhere we find that Krishna even descended into hell to teach souls in bondage. We have references to prison and to bondage. Hell is a prison and souls are in bondage. Souls are therefore in prison just as Peter says. **The writers of the Gospel of Luke and the first epistle of Peter seem greatly indebted to the Hindu bible in these passages.**

Another God who descended into hell was Quexalcoatl of Mexico (300 BC). The story will be found in the Codex Borgianus, wherein is related the account of his death, and burial after crucifixion, his descent into hell, and subsequent resurrection. After Adonis descended into hell, he rose again to life and immortality. Prometheus of Caucasus (600 BC) also suffered and descended into hell, rising again from the dead, and ascending to heaven. Horus first reigned a thousand years, then died, and was buried for three days, at the end of which time he triumphed over Typhon, the evil principle, and rose again to life evermore. And Osiris of Egypt also descended into hell and after a period of three days rose again. Homer and Virgil speak of Hercules, Ulysses and AEneas descending into Hades. The Gods became incarnate, and descended into hell to teach humility and set an example of suffering. The story of their descent into hell was doubtless invented to occupy them during their three days in the tomb.

THE EARLY CHURCH FATHERS TEACH THE SAME DOCTRINE ABOUT THE CHRIST

The doctrine was also taught by the Fathers of the Church. St. Chrysostom (born 347 A.D.) asks:

“Who but an infidel would deny that Christ was in hell?” (quoted by Bonwick; Egyptian Belief, p. 46).

And St. Clement of Alexandria, who flourished at the beginning of the third century, is equally clear and emphatic as to Jesus' descent into hell. He says:

“The Lord preached the gospel to those in Hades, as well as to all in earth, In order that all might believe and be saved, wherever they were. If, then, the Lord descended to Hades for no other end but to preach the gospel, as He did descend, it was either to preach the gospel to all, or to the Hebrews only. It accordingly to all, then all who believe shall be saved, although they may be of the Gentiles, on making their profession there”

Origen, who flourished during the latter part of the second, and beginning of the third centuries, also emphatically declares that Christ Jesus descended into hell (Origen, Contra Celsus, bk.ii. c. 48).

Ancient Christian works of art represent his descent into hell (Jameson, Hist. Of Our Lord in Art, vol. ii. pp. 364-365).

The apocryphal gospels teach the doctrine of Christ Jesus' descent into hell, the object of which was to preach to those in bondage there, and to liberate the Saints who had died before his advent on earth.

On account of the sin committed by Adam in the Garden of Eden, all mankind were doomed, all had gone to hell excepting those who had been translated to heaven—even those persons who were "after God's own heart," and who had belonged to his "chosen people." The coming of Christ Jesus into the world, however, made a change in the affairs of man. The saints were then liberated from their prison, and all those who believe in the efficacy of his name, shall escape hereafter the tortures of hell. This is the doctrine to be found in the apocryphal gospels, and was taught by the Fathers of the Church (Jameson, Hist. Of Our Lord in Art, vol. ii. pp. 250-251).

THE GOSPEL OF NICODEMUS

In the **Gospel of Nicodemus** (apoc.) is to be found the whole story of Christ Jesus' descent into hell, and of his liberating the saints. It goes like this:

Satan, and the Prince of Hell, having heard that Jesus of Nazareth was almost to descend to their domain, began to talk the matter over, as to what they should do, etc. While thus engaged, on a sudden, there was a voice as of thunder and the rushing of winds, saying: " Lift up your gates, O ye Princes, and be ye lifted up, O ye everlasting gates, and the King of Glory shall come in."

When the Prince of Hell heard this, he said to his impious officers: "Shut the brass gates . . . and make them fast with iron bare, and fight courageously."

The saint having heard what had been said on both sides, immediately spoke with aloud voice, saying: "Open thy gates, that the King of Glory may come in." The divine prophets, David and Isaiah, were particularly conspicuous in this protect against the intentions of the Prince of Hell.

Again the voice of Jesus was heard saying: " Lift up your gates, O Prince; and be ye lifted up, ye gates of hell, and the King of Glory will enter in." The Prince of Hell then cried out: " Who is the King of Glory" upon which the prophet David commenced to reply to him, but while he was speaking, the mighty Lord Jesus appeared in the form of a man, and broke asunder the fetters which before could not be broken, and crying aloud, said: " Come to me, all ye saints, who were created in my image, who were condemned by the tree of the forbidden fruit . . . live now by the word of my cross."

Then presently all the saints were joined together, hand in hand, and the Lord Jesus laid hold on Adam's hand, and ascended from hell, and all the saints of God followed him (Nicodemus; Apoc. Ch. xvi and xix).

When the saints arrived in paradise, two " very ancient men " met them, and were asked by the saints: " Who are ye, who have not been with us in hell, and have had your bodies placed in paradise?" One of these " very ancient men" answered and said: " I am Enoch, who was translated by the word of God, and this man who is with me is Elijah the Tishbite, who was translated in a fiery chariot" (Nicodemus; Apoc. Ch. xx).

THE NEW TESTAMENT'S WITNESS

The doctrine of the descent into hell may be found alluded to in the canonical books; thus, for instance, in I Peter:

"It is better, if the will of God be so, that ye suffer for well doing, than for evil doing. For Christ also bath suffered for sins, the just for the unjust, that he might bring us to God, being put to death in the flesh, but quickened by the spirit: by which he also went and preached unto the spirits in prison" (I Peter 3:17-19).

Again, in "Acts," where the writer is speaking of David as prophet, he says:

"He, seeing this before, spake of the resurrection of Christ, that his soul was not left in hell, neither his flesh did see corruption" (Acts 2:31).

The reason why Christ Jesus has been made to descend into hell, is because it is a part of the universal mythos, even the three days' duration. The Saviors of mankind had all done so, he must therefore do likewise. The Gentile redactors and writers of the New Testament only "patterned" the life of Jesus after their own pagan beliefs. Events in the life of the pagan Sun-gods and Saviors were transposed into the life of Christ.

Crishna, the Hindu Savior, descended into hell, for the purpose of raising the dead (the doomed), before he retired to his heavenly seat (Asiatic Researches, vol. i. p. 237; Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, p. 168).

Zoroaster, of the Persians, descended into hell (Monumental Christianity, p. 286).

Osiris, the Egyptian Savior, descended into hell (Dupuis, Origin of Religious Belief, p. 256; Bonwick Egyptian Belief, pp. 125).

Horus, the virgin-born Savior, descended into hell.

Adonis, the virgin-born Savior, descended into hell (Bell, Pantheon, vol. i. p. 12).

Bacchus, the virgin-born Savior, descended into hell (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. i. p. 322; Dupuis, Origin of Religious belief, p. 257; Dunlap, Mysteries Adoni, p. 33).

Hercules, the virgin-born Savior descended into hell (Taylor, Mysteries, p. 40; Mysteries of Adoni, pp. 94-96).

Mercury, the Word and Messenger of God, descended into hell (Bell, Pantheon, vol. ii. p. 72).

Baldur, the Scandinavian god, being killed ,descended into hell (Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, p. 169).

Quetzalcoatl, the Mexican crucified Savior, descended into hell (Mexican Antiquities, vol. i. vi. P. 166).

All these gods, and many others that might be mentioned remained in hell for the space of three days and three nights. "They descended into hell, and on the third day rose again."

SO WHY THE THREE DAY TIME PERIOD THAT THEY HAD TO REMAIN IN HELL?

One only need look at the stars to know the story. Also, this explains why nation after nation had the same story of the Sun-gods. They all studied the stars.

Thus the story of the three days' entombment has an astronomical explanation...the winter solstice. **The sun lies still and apparently motionless, neither ascending nor descending, for nearly three days at the midwinter solstice. It was thought by primitive man that the sun was in a tomb for three days having descended to Hell, the lowest point of its annual cycle.** In tracking the course of the sun man could detect the time when the sun shown least every year. For 3 days when the sun is the lowest in the horizon it appears to be motionless for 3 days then beings it northward ascent again. These 3 "shrrortest" days of the year provided the least amount of light of the whole year. The sun was believed to have died. The prayer was that it would rise again and the prayer always worked, **the sun was born-again each year at midwinter (raised from the dead) as it began it northward track in the sky.** However the **battle of light with darkness** (temptation) continued until the vernal equinox and only when the days became longer than the nights were the ancient astrologer priests happy to celebrate the sun's rebirth. So, the **birth of god was at the midwinter solstice but he was fully born again at the vernal equinox (spring).** Hence, **spring was chosen to represent this "three days' descent of the gods into hell and death because very shortly the days would get longer and spring would arrive with its new life and vegetation after the "death" of winter.** The Persians had an astronomical figure representing the descent of a god into hell and returning at the time that Orsus, the goddess of spring, had conquered the god of winter. The author of Revelation describes the Lamb of God (Rev 12) as conquering the dragon, which is the Scorpion or Dragon of the first month of winter, October, being conquered by the Lamb of March or spring.

NOW FOR SOME TOUGH QUESTIONS

If you are a "thinking believer" then you can easily see that the above story concerning Jesus is pure fiction based upon the primitive fears and suspicions of mankind. Hopefully today we know better. But to the point.

We possess a document that is touted to be "inspired, infallible, and inerrant;" the New Testament. As you can see we have a sever problem here both in I Peter and Acts let alone the doctrines emanating from such a book as expressed in the "Creed" of the Church.

Answer for yourself: If I Peter can be shown to be in error, what other "errors" are contained within it let alone other books in the New Testament?

Answer for yourself: If the writer of I Peter got it wrong about the descent into hell, what about other doctrines within the same verse: atonement, redemption, etc? Could he be wrong about these as well?

Answer for yourself: What about the book of Acts as well as it represents the Pauline mission with its doctrines as well?

WHAT DOES A JEWISH JESUS WHO PREACHED REPENTANCE AND OBEDIENCE TO THE COMMANDMENTS OF G-D GOT TO DO WITH SUN-MYTHS AND PAGAN SAVIORS?

DID G-D SEND HIS MESSIAH INTO THE WORLD IN PAGAN "DRAG?"



THE GOSPEL OF THE HEBREWS....WAS NOT THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW THAT WE NOW HAVE

The Gospel Of The Hebrews c. 70-150 C.E.

It is both odd and unfortunate that no copies of any of the so-called "Judeo-Christian" gospels have survived antiquity, though the texts, kept by early Christians who maintained deep-seated Jewish beliefs, were often quoted by Christian writers throughout the first five centuries. These short citations are our only windows through which we might study the traditions of the communities that used them. The Gospel of the Hebrews is the most often quoted of the Judeo-Christian gospels, though it must be noted that at least two other texts (Ebionites and Nazoreans) were referred to by the same title, and we can only make educated guesses as to which gospel each fragment was derived from. At least eight early writers had either referenced or cited from Hebrews, each offering their own interpretations and assessment of validity. From these we know the date of composition is no later than mid-second century, possibly much earlier. It was said to have been written in Hebrew, though much of its theology parallels Egyptian tradition. **The gospel shows no direct dependence upon the canonical gospels**, though it shares a verse with the Gospel of Thomas (GosThom 2). Among the most unique traditions is the depiction of Mary, like the Johannine logos, as divine—in fact, that she was the incarnation of Michael, who was the personification of the Holy Spirit. Also, Jesus first appears to his brother James following the resurrection. Since James the Just was traditionally held to have founded the church at Jerusalem, it is no surprise that the Hebrew gospel elevates his authority by making him the first to witness the risen Christ.

The Gospel of the Hebrews is a syncretistic, Jewish-Christian document which presents traditions of Jesus' preexistence and coming into the world, his baptism and temptation, some of his sayings, and the report of a resurrection appearance to his brother, James the Just. This is the Jewish-Christian gospel most frequently mentioned by name in the early church; it is also the only one whose original title has been transmitted from antiquity. The title seems to indicate the identity of the group who used this gospel, and may suggest that this was the gospel of predominately Greek-speaking Jewish Christians. The Gospel of the Hebrews has no connection with other Jewish-Christian gospels, displaying no kinship with the Gospel of Matthew. It is instructive to note that most of the extant fragments come from quotations in the writings of persons who lived in Alexandria, Egypt. The Gospel of the Hebrews may have been known to Papias (a church writer who died cat A.D. 130, whose five-volume "Exegesis of the Sayings of the Lord" is now lost, preserved only in a few quotations in the writings of Eusebius). Hegesippus (late in the second century) and Eusebius (early in the fourth century) attest to the existence of this gospel, but do not quote from it. Fragments are preserved in the writings of Clement of Alexandria (late in the second century), Origen (early in the third century), and Cyril (Bishop of Jerusalem, cat 350 C.E.). Jerome (ca. 400 C.E.) also preserves several fragments, all of which he probably reproduced from the writings of Origen. The extent of this gospel is no longer known. According to the list of "canonical" and "apocryphal" books drawn up by Nicephorus (Patriarch of Constantinople, 806-818 C.E.), the Gospel of the Hebrews contained 2200 lines, only 300 fewer than Matthew! The report of a resurrection appearance of Jesus to his brother, James, indicates the position of authority assigned to James in the Gospel of the Hebrews. It is well known that James was the leading figure of the conservative Jewish church in Jerusalem. Reports of his "con-version" by a vision of the risen Lord are well documented in the church

(compare 1 Cor. 15:7), and are based on an early, probably sound tradition. According to the report in the Gospel of the Hebrews, James was the very first witness of the resurrection, and thus its principal guarantor. He is so distinguished that he is even said to have taken part in the Last Supper of Jesus. The esteem in which James is held in this gospel may be used to locate the authority and secure the identity of the tradition of those communities which appealed to him as their leader. The accounts of Jesus' preexistence, coming, baptism, and temptation are abbreviated mythological narratives. They presuppose a myth of the descent of divine Wisdom, embodying herself definitively in a representative of the human race for the revelation and redemption of humankind. Such a myth was widespread in the Greco-Roman world and underlies many of the earliest Christological formulations of believers in Jesus, as evidenced, for example, in Pauline (Phil. 2:6-11), synoptic (Matt. 11:25-30; Luke 7:18-35; 11:49-51), and Johannine traditions (John 1:1-18), as well as in those of the Gospel of Thomas. More-over, the second saying of the Gospel of Thomas is also cited as part of the Gospel of the Hebrews, suggesting that this was a free-floating saying at home in Egypt as well as in Syria. The wisdom saying may permit the suggestion that the majority of the sayings in the Gospel of the Hebrews had the same character as those of the synoptic gospels. The extant fragments of the Gospel of the Hebrews display no dependence upon the writings of the New Testament. Unfortunately, it cannot be determined whether other portions of the text that are no longer preserved are in any way contingent upon these or any other writings which we now possess. The earliest possible date of the composition of the Gospel of the Hebrews would be in the middle of the first century, when Jesus traditions were first being produced and collected as part of the wisdom tradition. The latest possible date would be in the middle of the second century, shortly before the first reference to this gospel by Hegesippus and the quotations of it by Clement and Origen. Based on the parallels in the morphology of the tradition, an earlier date of composition is more likely than a later one. Internal evidence and external attestations indicate that Egypt was its place of origin. In the gospel citations of this gospel, care should be taken to distinguish between the actual quotations of the text of the Gospel of the Hebrews and the interpretive comments of the church writers who recorded the citations.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THE ESSENES...THE STORY OF CHRISTIAN ORIGINS

The religious faith of the occident, or the western world, consists substantially of a synthesis of beliefs and doctrines which had their origin in many lands and among various peoples and which were combined and proclaimed in what we may call the New Testament. Dispersed among the New Testament is this synthesis of religious beliefs amidst Biblical Judaism. The creeds, disciplines, and dogmas on which almost all the churches of Europe and the Americas and many of those in Asia are based, purport to derive their authority from these Gospels and Epistles; and all these multifarious communions proclaim that theirs is the religion established by Jesus, whom they revere as the Christ.

The principal concepts of the Christian Gospels, which have played so crucial a role in occidental life, can be traced to their ultimate sources. Over the last 15 years scores of old as well as modern books and hundreds of articles in encyclopedias were first read by way of orientation; but, since recondite knowledge is to be had only by a minute study of the sources, this soon became an industry. More than four years were consumed in the intensive study of ancient Egyptian, Persian, Brahmana, Gaina, Buddhist, Judaistic, Essene, and Christian literature. Quotations were copied and organized for easy reference. All the major streams of thought were then carefully analyzed. Important elements from various ancient cultures were discovered to have converged, first, in the Pythagorean thiasoi and then in the Essene Order, whence the Christian Gospel emerged, which, in turn, proceeded to penetrate the emotions and to achieve dominion over the Graeco-Roman world.

THE ESSENE RELIGIOUS SYNTHESIS

The Essenes, lately the object of so much attention, play a central role in our drama. They were an extraordinary group of Jewish communist-celibates who, in their formative stage about 170 B.C.E., absorbed the metaphysics and the eschatology of the Zoroastrians, and then, some sixty-five years later, by becoming Pythagoreans, incorporated into their system much of the discipline and soteriology of the mystery-cults of Greece and Asia Minor. Upon all this, they engrafted a Christology which combined a Persian with a Messianic Judaic concept, which, in a period of crisis, they personalized in their martyred Teacher of Righteousness, whom they expected to return upon the clouds about 35-30 B. C., accompanied by myriads of angels to conduct the Last Judgment. If you were to invest study into these areas it would be your conclusion, based on the evidence and facts available for your inspection, that Jesus was an Essene who, convinced that he was himself the incarnate Christ destined to redeem and judge mankind, left the Order of the Essenes (strict Pharisees) for the purpose of creating a mass-movement.

The certainty finally emerges that Christianity was a highly composite doctrine which combined many of the age-old religious concepts first developed by Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Buddhists, and Greeks, as well as by Jews, Phrygians, Syrians, and other inhabitants of Asia Minor. It was congenitally related to all of these; and when any of them accepted Christianity, they were simply recovering what was, at least in part, originally their own. This explains the ease at

which Gentile Christianity became a world religion, yet had its roots in a Jewish movement. In the light of worldwide anti-Semitism this is amazing to say the least.

We at Bet Emet feel that the realization of this fact must induce among all sectarians a definite humility, which should in turn, contribute toward eliminating those doctrinal differences which divide our society into a multiplicity of groups shut off from each other by ideological barriers, as if we all lived in hermetically sealed compartments, incapable of fellowship or communion.

THE CORE OF ESSENE TEACHING IN RELATIONSHIP TO SALVATION

Mature Essenism taught the following concepts as synthesized from Egyptians, Babylonians, Assyrians, Persians, Buddhists, and Greeks, as well as by Jews, Phrygians, Syrians:

- **That the human race is divided into two groups which are forever separated, the Elect and the unrighteous, the Children of Light and the Children of Darkness**
- **That the former may be redeemed for everlasting glory in heaven, but only through divine intervention; that a god-man (Angel-Messiah) must appear as a human being on earth, and, in fact, had appeared, to bring salvation to humanity**
- **That all of the Elect who accept him and become his disciples will be redeemed; that all others are doomed to super eternally in hell fire**
- **That the Children of Light are made manifest through their celibacy, saintly brotherhood, and communal poverty and equalitarianism**
- **That the god-man is the Soter, i.e., the divine sacrifice who gives his life for many and whose flesh and blood are consumed by his communicants so that they too may become divine and immortal**
- **That in his first manifestation the savior proclaims his revelation; that after his death, he returns to the Father for a period while his followers preach his gospel; that before the end of the then existing generation he would certainly return in a grand Parousia to judge all mankind and establish the kingdom of heaven.**

This was the Essene-Christian faith, which is also the religion of the occident.

This gospel consists primarily of four basic elements: soteriology, eschatology, ethics, and the Messianic concept. **If one is to be honest with the material available in relationship to Christian doctrine and dogma, he must first consider the sources of this Essene soteriology, that is to say, its doctrine concerning the incarnate godman who dies for humanity and whose body and blood must be consumed sacramentally so that the Elect may become divine and immortal. As you see salvation did not come from faith and obedience, but through mystic rituals involved in the eating allegorically the flesh of a godman and the symbolic drinking of the blood of this godman.** The trail leads us first to the Nile, where civilization and organized religion began in the dim reaches of tile prehistoric past.

The first officially authentic Essene scriptures were published shortly after an Arab goatherd, following one of his animals, stumbled into a cave near the Dead Sea, where a treasure-trove of ancient documents was found, several of which were virtually intact. By a strange succession of fortunate incidents, these were quickly published, and that made available to the world.

This set off one of the most intensive archeological hunts in history; scholars and scientists hastened to the Judaeen desert in search of additional Scrolls. In this, they were signally successful: remnants, large and small, of hundreds of Essene scriptures were recovered, all of which had been secreted in sealed jars about 69 A.D. Material was found in at least five caves, of which that in Cave 4 alone constituted a corpus of original Essene scripture sufficient, should it be translated and published, to fill two volumes the size of the King James version of the Bible.

Then, however, strange things began to occur. In the beginning, and for several years, no portion of this treasure, deposited in the Jordanian Museum in Jerusalem, has been published, or even made available to scholars. Of the 8 men, appointed to collate, arrange, publish, and translate these documents, 4 were Roman Catholics; and only John Marco Allegro, the English researcher, was without denominational affiliation. When he quickly translated and published the Copper Scroll and the few fragments entrusted to him; and then when he declared that the Essene Teacher of Righteousness, executed by the Jewish priests about 70-68 B.C., may have been **crucified**, he was denied all further access to the Scroll material.

As year after year passed away without the appearance of any more Essene scripture, although from time to time elaborate promises were made that they would soon be available, many began to question the reasons for the delay and the concealment.

Since then, ample time has elapsed for the preparation and publication of all Essene material. But not one line of the hundreds of pages found in the caves has been released until the last few years.

Although additional Essene scriptures failed to appear, there was a plethora of books and articles dealing with the cult and its Scrolls during the years following 1950. Dozens of books and hundreds of articles, expressing every conceivable point of view, have appeared. It is probable that a complete bibliography of all material printed in this field might comprise somewhere between 1,500 and 2,000 titles.

During the Six-Day War of 1967, the Jewish force overran Jerusalem and captured the Jordanian Museum. To the best of our knowledge, nothing has been published concerning the fate or the whereabouts of the Essene Scrolls—the most precious concentration of ancient literature ever discovered in modern times.

Until recently no outsider, of course, knew the contents of these documents; but it seems difficult to doubt that there was a constructive conspiracy to conceal them and to prevent their publication. All discussion concerning the Scrolls seems to have been silenced for years and only recently all the contents of the scrolls have been made public.

The motive for this concealment, we believe, is not far to seek. Although the evidence linking pristine Christianity to the Dead Sea Covenanters is already very substantial, there are still men of stature who deny the existence of such a relation. ship. With the release of the later documents, it was established beyond all doubt that Christianity grew out of Essenism.

The concealing the Essene scriptures for years was an concerted effort by Christian religious authorities in hopes of preventing or forestalling the the verification made from them that pristine Christianity developed from an esoteric Jewish cult which had forsaken Judaism as we understand it and gravitated toward a Pythagorean, Buddhist, Iranian apocalyptic sect. We believe, secondly, that the whole orthodox or so-called Christian world, with its material assets worth hundreds of billions of dollars, wishes to preserve the myth of its unique origin, founded on the inspired message of a god-man whose only source of doctrine or inspiration was the creator of the universe. **The Dead Sea Scrolls prove otherwise!**

The vested interests of those religious communities are therefore at stake; they will not, if they can prevent it, permit the publication of authentic materials which may eventually reduce their influence and credibility and, more importantly, cause a decline in their wealth and income. Thankfully, they forestalled the publication of these scrolls but could not prevent it.

Since most people read only what reinforces the persuasions they have already accepted, we realize that few indeed among those already committed to some creed will be motivated to read these articles. Edwin Franden Dakin once remarked that the greatest miracle in the world is the capacity of humanity to believe—without evidence. Most people are nurtured by their delusions. However, true education or enlightenment cannot exist except among those who follow St. Paul's dictum to try all things and in the end retain the good.

In these articles and web-pages, therefore, we have sought the truth concerning Gentile Christianity and how it

borrowed from all religions by examining their own sacred scriptures: our position being that if these are internally unassailable, they probably constitute a solid foundation for faith. However, if they are filled with discrepancies, contradictions, and presentations which are mutually exclusive; if they are patently false or even ridiculous on their face, how can those who rely on them for ultimate truth confirm themselves in their belief except by refusing to examine the most obvious facts? How can divine infallibility be claimed for "revelations" which bear every earmark of forgery or folk-myth?

We have submitted the evidence and conclusions found in the following pages to critics everywhere who would assuredly be delighted to demonstrate their error or fallacy; but, since they cannot deny the words of their own official Scriptures, no one has been able to impugn anything we have written. It is one thing to deny something; but it is entirely another thing to refute it. Emotion and zeal is a poor substitute for facts and evidence!

We are well aware of how desperately suffering humanity craves the consolation of religion, and we do not for a moment deny that millions obtain this from delusions which are as unfounded as they are irrational and untruthful. Again, what we don't know will not hurt us...until we die and find out we were wrong!

We believe, however, that it is possible for an increasing number of men and women to develop and embrace a system of ethics and intellectual superstructure which will create a happy and successful life without the fear of imagined specters or a dependence upon false dogmas. Many are they who have done so. We at Bet Emet look forward to a time when a large portion of the human race will obtain the moral and intellectual elevation which will enable them to live according to truths revealed by GOD and not by the false religious beliefs of men desiring power and authority over the people. Shalom.



ADOPTIONISM...THE EARLIEST BELIEF ABOUT JESUS

Put most simply, adoptionism is the theory that Jesus was in nature a man who became G-d by adoption. Most identify this event with his baptism. The [Ebionites](#) were the earliest to teach "adoptionism" concerning the nature of Jesus.

The earliest extant work which expresses this position is the [Shepherd of Hermas](#), thought to be written by the brother of the bishop of Rome about A D 150. It taught that the Redeemer was a virtuous man chosen by G-d, and with him the Spirit of G-d was united. He did the work to which G-d had called him; in fact, he did more than was commanded. Therefore he was by divine decree adopted as a son and exalted to great power and lordship. This book was consistently considered "scripture" by the earliest church writers and finds its way into the earliest "canon" lists of the Early Church Fathers. Later it will be removed and we no longer have it in our New Testament for obvious reasons.

Adherents of this Christology who were **declared heretics in the third century** asserted it had at one time been the dominant view in Rome and that it had been handed down by the apostles. This view was perpetuated in the second and third century church by the dynamistic monarchians, who taught that Christ was a mere man on whom the power of G-d came and who was then adopted or constituted the Son of G-d. A leader in that general movement was Theodotus, who came to Rome from Byzantium about 190. He taught that Jesus was a man who was born of a virgin through the operation of the Holy Spirit. After the piety of his life had been tested, the Holy Spirit descended on him at the baptism. By this means he became Christ and received the power for his special ministry. But he was still not fully G-d; that was achieved through resurrection. Theodotus was excommunicated by the Roman Church, and the effort of his followers to found a separate church early in the third century had little success.

Adoptionism was an attempt to explain the divine and human natures in Christ and their relation to each other. And as the great Christological debates raged during the fourth and fifth centuries, there were always a few who could be accused of taking this position. It did not flare again extensively, however, until the latter part of the eighth century, when it produced a commotion in the Spanish and Frankish churches. Elipandus, bishop of Toledo from c. 780, in his writings on the Trinity expressed the view that Christ was an adopted son; Felix, bishop of Urgel in the Pyrenees, taught a similar position soon thereafter. Numerous local churchmen opposed them; and their teachings were condemned by three synods under Charlemagne, who assumed the position of ruler of the church in his realm and who was concerned with its unity. Pope Adrian I also became involved, and the recantation of both men was obtained. They had a numerous following, however, and extensive efforts were required to bring these people back into the fold. The effects of the controversy lasted for decades in Toledo. Possibly remnants of the old Arian heresy contributed to the popularity of adoptionism at this time. A sound refutation of adoptionism was never made, and leanings in that direction appeared in some scholastic writings during the late Middle Ages.

H F Vos Bibliography. A Harnack, [History of Dogma](#).



EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #1

Over the years our faithful readership has learned a lot. Again we make significant strides in this current study in discerning truth from error that surrounds such very important topics for the Christian like the crucifixion of Jesus and its relationship to atonement as taught by Paul in the New Testament. Again, if you have read this ministry's materials over the last years you have come complete understanding that much that is found in the New Testament has pagan origins and often this involves such "sacred" Christian doctrines like atonement. This escapes the new believer and often the "seasoned" believer if he has never had the opportunity for such study. If you are a new reader of our ministry's materials then the above statements can be quite difficult to handle and often this diminished one's desire to even look into such subjects. But truth is truth and lies are lies and anyone's worship of the Creator demands faithfulness to our Creator's Truth.

Not often, but in this case I feel warranted to caution my readership that certain necessary foundations will be necessary to be able to comprehend, understand, assimilate, and draw the proper conclusions from the data that will be presented in this series of articles. Let me explain.

Over the years we at Bet Emet have demonstrated that the Christian Old Testaments in the vast majority of Christian Bibles are a compilation of purposeful misquotes and mistranslations of the Jewish Masoretic Palestinian text which has been preserved by the Jewish people for over thousands of years. This shocking revelation is open for all to see if they only knew it existed and were interested to look. Of paramount importance for the Christian are their cardinal doctrines of atonement as much of it is taken from Isaiah 53. The problem is that Isaiah the prophet as read in the Hebrew Masoretic text in pertinent passages like Isa. 53 reads completely different than the "Christian edition". We as followers of Yeshua deserve a translation and not a fictional creationism. This purposeful errors in translation was done long, long ago and few Christians and Pastors are aware. They never knew to look! This fact alone means the Isaiah 53 that Christians read is not the Isaiah 53 that Yeshua read! This should up set you; especially since most of the New Testament's atonement teachings are grounded in a falsified text. So, before you read this series of articles, it is mandatory for you to become aware of such a terrible problem that exists with the Christian's Old Testament in the places enumerated. Understand as well that when the New Testament references Isaiah that it as well is mistaken and is quoting and referring to an adulterated text. You should understand up front that the Jews can be shown to only have translated the first five books of the Old Testament into Greek and the rest was done later by non-Jews at the religious capital of the world in that day...Alexandria Egypt. This explains how "pagan ideas" and "pagan religious beliefs" were intermixed among the pages of your Christian Old Testament and was later by default referenced by the New Testament. Our ministry has prepared a detailed expose of such conspiracy and have available on request the documentation of such errors in Isaiah 53. This material is necessary for anyone who desires to read the articles forthcoming in this current series.

Likewise, it is necessary before continuing this series of articles for one to completely understand the Sacrificial System in 'DETAIL'. Over the years of my pastorate I encountered continually a level of misinformation and mis-instruction in Gentile Christianity that was of a staggering proportion. Whether one listens to the radio, tunes in on the television, or even listens to Pastors Sunday after Sunday the level of misinformation is

staggering. I ought to know; I used to be part of it. I was well educated in one of the finest religious institutions in America where I obtained a Masters in theology with high honors. I continued to study and dedicated myself to such following Seminary and it was there by using the many skills acquired in Seminary that I researched almost every area of my faith. My intentions were not to prove anything wrong at all; I was just in love with God. I wanted to draw closer to Him and help my fellowship do likewise and the better equipped and prepared I made myself the better I could serve the people in this capacity. However, over the years I encountered many things that challenged my "faith" and what I had been taught to accept on "faith alone". Not wishing to be bested, I set out to prove the detractors wrong and vindicate myself and my faith. Honestly, over the years my knees had to bow to a higher truth often as I encountered facts, archeological evidence, reproducible history, and unrefutable evidence that proved that much of what I had accepted by "faith alone" was in truth "lies and error". I had been duped and never knew it; that is, until I studied my blessed assurance off. I could list almost innumerable accounts where by Christian religious belief system was shown to be in error. This is simply because my Christian religious belief system was grounded in a document that could, with just a little effort, be shown to be incompatible with the "facts". I had no choice but to repent because now God and me both knew the truth. If I had to pick an area in Christian theology where almost little light and truth resides that would be in the Christian's understanding of the Sacrificial System. My whole Christian life I had been taught that the "Jews" believe "this" and "that" about the Sacrificial System. Again, I was taught wrong. It was not until I met some Rabbis and asked them one on one about many questions that I had about the Bible that I was able to be the beneficiary of the "light" to the nations. Imagine my surprise when I found out that what I had been told by my Christian leaders that the Jews believe was just the opposite. These encounters only provoked more study on my part. I have said all this to say this: it is mandatory that you have an accurate understanding of the Sacrificial System, the dynamics involved in the role of the blood as it "represents" the soul of the sacrifice. You will come to understand that the whole of the Sacrificial System in reality did not PROVIDE ATONEMENT, it only "WITNESSED" to an already received atonement prior to the slaying of the animal! This crucial truth is mandatory for any Christian to understand even if his goal was not to read the remainder of these articles.

If you have not had the opportunity yet to acquaint yourself with this necessary knowledge, STOP right not and request these valuable and vital informative articles be sent you at once. I tell everyone to believe nothing I say or teach. You must study this out for yourself to prove to yourself these things be so. The references are available to the serious student...just ask. We will be glad to help you find the source documents that expose your "falsehoods" and that will lead you to repentance and more proper worship of God. My prayer is that you will respond and study these articles in detail and let it soak in. Use the greatest organ God ever gave man; his mind and THINK! Now and only now will you be able to handle what comes next. Shalom.



EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #2

It is taken for granted that the current reader has accomplished the goal of the first article: you have read the materials necessary to continue our study in this set of articles. Hopefully the goals were reached:

1. You now possess a more complete understanding of what the original Isaiah both wrote and taught. Along with this comes a major change in your understanding of "the Suffering Servant" as Israel and the role it plays in the atonement. You now know better that to read only "Jesus" into every verse!
2. You now possess a complete understanding of how atonement was accomplished prior to the sacrifice of the animal and it's blood being placed on the altar in communion and right standing with God. You now understand the whole process of animal sacrifice was but a picture of the soul of the sacrificer "at that moment". It either was "right" with God or not when then animals was sacrificed. Along with this you can now understand Isaiah 1, for instance, when such wanton destruction of animal life without the necessary spiritual dynamics at work in the heart of the sacrificer "wearied" God.

THE ORIGIN OF ATONEMENT...YOU MIGHT BE SURPRISED

Almost everyone will point to Adam and Eve and the animals skins and say: "see there, that is the first sacrifice for sin". Where is the word "sin offering" mentioned in the text? Somehow I missed it. Well, then they will say: "Cain and Abel brought offerings and these were for sin". Again, where does it say that these were "sin offerings" or that they brought atonement? We could go on and mention Noah, but again such offerings have something in common with all that went before: the complete silence or mention of : "sin offering", or "atonement". Dear one, if we choose to read into anything we read what we want to "believe" then there is no purpose in continuing our study of anything. We are to draw out, exegete, the text to discern what is meant in the event under question.

For your information the first mention of "sin offering" and "atonement" in the Bible is found FOLLOWING THE GOLDEN CALF incident:

Exod 29:14

14 But the flesh of the bullock, and his skin, and his dung, shalt thou burn with fire without the camp: it is a sin offering.

Exod 29:33

33 And they shall eat those things wherewith the atonement was made, to consecrate and to sanctify them: but a stranger shall not eat thereof, because they are holy.

What should concern us is if these two related incidents are the first examples of "sin offering" and "atonements" known to man.

The punishment of an individual by crucifixion, for claiming to be "King of the Jews," "Son of God," or "The Christ;" which are the causes assigned by the writers of the New Testament for the Crucifixion of Jesus, would need but a passing glance in our study, were it not for the fact that there is much attached to it of a DOGMATIC and HEATHENISH nature. Therefore this topic demands more considerably more than a "passing glance." The doctrine of atonement for sin has been preached long before the doctrine was deduced from the Christian Scriptures; even longer than the writing of the Old Testament. Before the period assigned for the birth of Christ Jesus, the poet Ovid had assailed the demoralizing delusion with the most powerful shafts of philosophic scorn: "**When thou thyself are guilty," says he, "why should a victim die for thee? What folly it is to expect salvation from the death of another."**

The idea of expiation by the sacrifice of a god was to be found among the Hindus even in Vedic times. The sacrificer was mystically identified with the victim, which was regarded as the ransom from sin, and the instrument of its annulment. The Rig-Veda represents the gods as sacrificing Purusha, the primeval male, supposed to be coequal with the Creator. This idea is even more remarkably developed in the Tandya-brahmanas, thus:

"The lord or creatures *offered himself a sacrifice for the gods.*"

And again, in the Satapatha-brahmana:

"He who, knowing this, sacrifices the *Purusha-medha*, or sacrifice of the *primeval male*, becomes everything" (Monier Williams: Hinduism, pp. 36-40).

Prof. Monier Williams, from whose work on Hinduism I quoted above, brings to our attention that long before Moses and any Old Testament there existed in pagan religion mystical allusions to the sacrifice of a **representative man**.

THE \$64,000 DOLLAR QUESTION

In the pursuit of truth I want to be above board and fair at all costs. This is not always done by those who publish or print their findings. You many not know it but many "opinions" are sold today and read as fact. This is not what we do at Bet Emet. We provide the facts and the evidence and let the reader make up his mind. I believe that you need to make an intelligent decision and that is impossible unless you have the facts.

Such a revelation of the "sacrificial representative man" means either ONE OF three things:

1. YHVH gave primeval mankind the paradigm or pattern of the sacrificial representative man for all mankind...and there was no need for Israel to be a "light" to anyone...
2. Primeval mankind developed such a pattern of the sacrificial representative man from evolutionary beliefs connected with sun worship...and Paul and others only incorporated Yeshua within an already existing pagan religious belief system when "evangelizing" the Gentiles....these Gentile ambassadors gave the non-Jews nothing new....that that did not already believe or cherish...they only changed the names of their sun gods and elaborated upon these god's atoning deaths..
3. Having read the prior articles on Isaiah 53 and the Sacrificial System, you are beginning to see the horrible evidence that you have not the truth concerning atonement and the meaning of the death of Yeshua

WE BETTER LISTEN TO YESHUA'S WARNING

Matt 24:24

24 For there shall arise false Christs, and false prophets, and shall shew great signs and wonders; insomuch

that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect.

First of all you need to understand the word translated "Christs" in verse 24 only means "anointed" and not what you more than likely thought....a False Messiah. The warning is not to be deceived by many who present themselves as anointed of God for this or that purpose. Believe me, this is rampant today. One only needs to listen to the multitude of conflicting doctrines emanating from over the 2000 different Christian denominations that all preach different Jesuses.

To our question in point.

Answer for yourself: It is possible that in your Christian religious belief system you have, without knowing, accepted a belief in a sacrificial representative man that originated with sun worship and paganism, and have rejected or never known up to now the truths concerning these things addressed in this article?

In the pages that follow I will present OVERWHELMING evidence to help you see the truth. I will not tell you now which of the above 3 scenarios is true. I want you to see the evidence for yourself and you make up your own mind. Understand that faith is necessary and I consider myself a man of faith. However, faith is only necessary in the absence of facts and reproducible evidence. When one deals with facts and evidence little "needs to be hoped for" as Hebrews says except the common sense to recognize truth and facts when you see it. Unfortunately to come to knowledge that dispels the darkness of doubt and error one must read and often reading is technical. In the next pages you will encounter hundreds and hundreds of facts and evidence that will paint for you a picture that will be undeniable to the mind. And before some of our detractors say that faith is not to be intellectualized, let me remind you what Yeshua said was the Greatest Commandment.....

Matt 22:36-38

36 Master, which is the great commandment in the law?

37 Jesus said unto him, Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul, and with all thy mind.

38 This is the first and great commandment.

Notice Yeshua said man was to love God FIRST with all his heart....what did he mean? Love God with my blood pumping organ? No!

Let us examine the Greek behind the English and see what we learn!

2588 kardia-heart

a) that organ in the animal body which is the center of the circulation of the blood, and, hence, was regarded as the seat of physical life

b) denotes the center of all physical and spiritual life

a) the vigor and sense of physical life

b) the center and seat of spiritual life

1) the soul or mind, as it is the fountain and seat of the thoughts, passions, desires, appetites, affections, purposes, endeavors

2) used of the understanding, the faculty and seat of the intelligence

3) used of the will and character

4) used of the soul so far as it is affected and stirred in a bad way or good, or of the soul as the seat of the sensibilities, affections, emotions, desires, appetites, passions

c) used of the middle or central or inmost part of anything, even though inanimate

If you read the above definitions you found something rather interesting...Yeshua said that the Greatest Commandment was to first love God with all your MIND. He tells us we are to use our seat of intelligence to understand God. So help me that is impossible from prayer alone or else there would not be over a billion Catholics in the world to day praying to Mary. So knowledge of God is very important...and let us understand we are concerned about knowledge that is true and not false.

Hosea 6:6

6 For I [God speaking] desired mercy, and not sacrifice; and the knowledge of God more than burnt offerings.

There we find it again. More than any sacrifice, possibly more than any sacrificial representative man [but we are yet to determine that], God says He desires mankind possess the knowledge of Him more than any sacrifice. Wow! As we continue our study you will be able when finished to say unequivocally whether such sacrifices would include a "representative man" or not.

I would have you hold one thought before we move to the next article.

Answer for yourself: If it can be shown to you that this "representative man and his sacrifice" originated not with YHVH but with sun worship and pagans, then why then were not **the Pagans the Lord's chosen people** instead of the children of Israel who have rejected such crucified representative men since their origin and yet do so today? Wow, the implications of such a question let alone it's answers are devastating for the New Testament's doctrines and Paul's teachings. Shalom.



EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #3

THE ORIGIN OF SACRIFICE

The idea of redemption from sin through the sufferings and death of a Divine Incarnate Savior, is simply the crowing point of the idea entertained by primitive man that gods demanded a sacrifice of some kind, to atone for some sin, or avert some calamity.

In primitive ages, when men lived mostly on vegetables, they offered only grain, water, salt, fruit, and flowers to the gods, to propitiate them and thereby obtain temporal blessings. But when they began to eat meat and spices, and drink wine, they offered the same; naturally supposing the deities would be pleased with whatever was useful or agreeable to themselves. They imagined that some gods were partial to animals, others to fruits, flowers, etc. To the celestial gods they offered white victims at sunrise, or at open day. To the infernal gods they sacrificed black animals in the night. Each god has some creature peculiarly devoted to his worship. They sacrificed a bull to Mars, a dove to Venus;, and to Minerva, a heifer without blemish, which had never been put to the yoke. If a man was too poor to sacrifice a living animal, he offered an image of one made of bread.

In the course of time, it began to be imagined that the gods demanded something more sacred as offerings or atonements for sin. This led to the sacrifice of human beings, principally slaves and those taken in war, then, their own children, even their most beloved "first born." It came to be an idea that every sin must have it prescribed amount of punishment, **and that the gods would accept the life of one person as atonement for the sins of others. This idea prevailed in Greece and Rome; areas where much of the New Testament would be written later [THINK].**

In the beginning such sacrifices by one for the sins of others were found only among heroic self-sacrifice for the public good but that would change over time. Cicero says: "The force of religion was so great among our ancestors, that some of their commanders have, with their faces veiled, and with the strongest expressions of sincerity, **sacrificed themselves to be immortal gods to save their country**" (Prog. Relig. Ideas, Vol. I, p. 303).

In Egypt, offerings of human sacrifices, for the atonement of sin, became an almost daily occurrence. When the Egyptian priests offered up a sacrifice to the gods, they pronounced the following imprecations on the head of the victim:

"If any evil is about to befall either those who now sacrifice, or Egypt in general, **may it be averted on his head**" (Herodotus: bk. ii, ch. 39).

The idea of atonement finally resulted in the belief that the incarnate "**Christ**", the **Anointed one, the representative man, the God among us, was to save mankind from a curse** imposed by God. Man had sinned, and God would not and did not forgive without a propitiatory **sacrifice**. The curse of God must be removed from the **sinful society**, and the **sinless** must bear the load of that curse. It was asserted that **divine justice** required blood . **Now notice this is the religious belief system of Pagans and not Moses or Joshua or David. This**

religious belief system occurred long, long before Moses, Sinai, or Torah. These are the beliefs of pagans as found from nation to nation as archeology and anthropology have proven. The facts of this religious system are found around the globe and the evidence confront us with the reality of what I said!

You should be curious as to how nations on the other side of the globe, deprived of cell phones in their day, was able to have almost identical copies of the same religion long before there was ever an Abraham or a Moses. The key, as you will find, as I did, was that sun worship was the tie that bonded their religious beliefs together. More on that later.

The belief of redemption from sin by the suffering of a Divine Incarnation, whether by death on a stake, pole, tree, or cross or otherwise, was general and popular among the heathen, centuries before the time of Jesus of Nazareth, and this dogma, no matter how sacred it may have become, or how consoling it may be, must fall along with the rest of the material of which the Gentile Church is built.

Julius Firmicius, referring to this popular belief among the Pagans, says: "The devil has his Christs". This will amaze you but this was the general off-hand manner in which the Christian Fathers disposed of such matters when pagans accused them of copying their pagan religious doctrines. The only resource at hand when cornered was to blame it on the Devil. The Devil was for the Gentile Church, when cornered and exposed by the facts by Pagans who confronted them about their plagiarized religious doctrines, a religious counterfeiter. The Devil, for the church, served as a prophet for things to come. Surely you see the incredibility of such a statement. But what else is new? Most Protestants resort to the same techniques today when such facts come across their path. Some, a little more original, will say that the whole this is nothing but types and figures played over and over again from nation to nation and finally culminating in Jesus of Nazareth. This sounds plausible if it were not for one thing....the existing evidence of sun worship and its inherent doctrines. When one comes to the full understanding of such Pagan worship, along with its manifested evolutionary and variegated religious doctrines, and if one happens to be a traditional Christian, **then there is no nightmare worse than this in this life. The absolute horror of the reality will strike home....you are a sun-worshipper for YHWH....and the last time I looked He called people to repent of this and continually spoke very negatively about such religion and people in the Tanakh!**

As I have done in prior articles, I will now present a parade of information of staggering proportion. I will first turn to India, where we shall find, in the words of M. l'Abbe Huc, that "the idea of redemption by a divine representative," who came into the world for the express purpose of redeeming mankind, was "general and popular" (Huc's Travels, Vol. I, pp. 326-327).

"A sense of original corruption," says Prof. M. Williams, seems to be felt by all Hindus, as indicated by the following prayer used after the Gayatri by some Vaishnavas:

"I am sinful, I commit sin, my nature is sinful, I am conceived in sin, Save me, O thou lotus-eyed Heri (Savior), the remover of sin" (M. Williams, Hinduism, p. 214).

Chrishna, the virgin-born, "the Divine Vishnu himself," (Vishnu Purana, p. 440), "he who is without beginning, middle or end," (Ibid.), being moved "to relieve the earth of her load," (Ibid.), came upon earth and redeemed man by his suffering...to save him. You need to understand right now we are dealing with a religious belief system of Pagans that preceded Jesus of Nazareth by some 800 years!

The accounts of the deaths of most all virgin-born Saviors of whom I shall speak, are conflicting in some areas. It is stated in one place that such an one died in such a manner, and in another place we may find it stated altogether differently. One might be so inclined to dismiss the matter because of the lack of uniformity surrounding the deaths of the various virgin-born Saviors. But let me assure you that once you come to the knowledge of the vast storehouse of religious doctrines that evolved from Sun Worship, then you will completely understand that each different variety of virgin-born Savior's deaths are nothing more different manifestations of the sun; it setting, the sun being occluded by storms, the change of seasons, eclipse, etc. This will simply amaze you when we come to it!

As the Rev. Geo. W Cox remarks, in his Aryan Mythology, Chrishna is described, in one of his aspects, as a self-sacrificing and unselfish hero, a being who is filled with divine wisdom and love, who offers up a sacrifice which he alone can make (Aryan Mythology, Vol. ii, p. 132). I hope you noticed but not all Pastors are ignorant of this deception. Some have studied to the level to see these things and have been so moved to alert and warn the flock of the terrible conspiracy which has overtaken the brethren. Such a one I believe I am as well.

The Vishnu Purana speaks of Chrishna being shot in the foot with an arrow [think], and states this was the cause of his death. Other accounts, however, state that he was suspended on a tree [think], or in other words **"crucified"** [think] (Vishnu Purana, pp. 274, 612). Remember this was 800 years prior to Jesus of Nazareth.

Confirmation of the above can be found from Mons. Guigniaut, in his Religion de Antiquite, where he says: "The death of Chrishna is very differently related. One remarkable and convincing tradition makes him perish on a **tree**, to which he was **nailed** by the stroke of an arrow".

Rev. J. P. Lundy alludes to this passage of Guigniaut's in his Monumental Christianity, and translates the passage as a **"cross" instead of a "tree."** One can often find Chrishna as represented as **hanging on a cross**, and we know that a **cross** was frequently called the **"accursed tree."** It was an ancient custom to use trees as gibbets for crucifixion, or, if artificial, to call the cross a tree (Higgins, Anacalypsis, Vol. I, p. 499 and Mrs. Jameson's History of Our Lord in Art, ii, 317, where the cross is called the "accursed tree").

Even later in the Old Testament the writer of Deuteronomy is so influenced as he speaks of hanging criminals upon a tree, as though it was a general custom, and says in Deut. 21:22-23:

22 And if a man have committed a sin worthy of death, and he be to be put to death, and thou hang him on a tree:

23 His body shall not remain all night upon the tree, but thou shalt in any wise bury him that day; (for he that is hanged is accursed of God;) that thy land be not defiled, which the LORD thy God giveth thee for an inheritance.

The subject of the verses is that if one breaks the Law of God and it just so happens to demand the death penalty, then it shall be carried out. Such a criminal must pay the price for his sin for the wages of sin is death, and in particular sometime death in this life! His body was to be hung publicly as a deterrent for others to learn not to follow such disastrous ways. Yet the body, tattered and bruised as it became, was yet made in the image of God and to allow the public display of such a body beyond a day was an affront to God and God would bring judgment on the community if such a body was not removed.

Later Paul recasts Jesus in the tradition of Chrishna when he says in Galatians 3:13: "Christ hath redeemed us from the curse of the law, being made a curse for us; for it is written, 'Cursed is every one that hangeth on a tree.'"

It is evident, then, that to be hung on a cross was anciently called hanging on a tree, and to be hung on a tree was called crucifixion. We may therefore conclude from this, and from what we will now see, that Chrishna was said to have been crucified.

It the earlier copies of Moor's Hindu Pantheon, is to be seen representations of Chrishna, with marks of holes in both feet, and in others, of holes in the hands. Some representations show holes in both feet and some even have a round hole in his side like Jesus. Some have hanging from his collar or shirt the emblem of a heart which we often see in pictures of Jesus in the Catholic Church. Instead of the crown of thorns usually put on the head of the Christian Savior, Chrishna has the turreted coronet of the Ephesian Diana.

Rev. J.P. Lundy, speaking of the Christian crucifix, says: "I object to the crucifix because it is an image, and liable to grown in abuse, just as the old Hindu crucifix was an idol" (Lundy, Monumental Christianity, p. 128).

And Dr. Inman says: "Chrishna, whose history so closely resembles our Lord's, was also like him in his being

crucified" (Ancient Paths, vol. I, p. 411).

The writers of the New Testament relates that when Jesus was crucified two others were crucified with him, one of whom, through his favor, went to heaven. One of the crucified others reviled him, but the other said to Jesus: "Lord, remember me when thou comest into thy kingdom.: And Jesus said to him: "Verily I say unto thee, to-day shalt thou be with me in paradise." According to the Vishnu Purana, the hunter who shot the arrow at Chrishna afterwards said unto him: "Have pity upon me, who am consumed by my crime, for thou art able to consume me!" Chrishna replied: "Fear not thou in the least. Go, hunter, through my favor, to heaven, the abode of the gods." Then it is reported that Chrishna, having united himself with his own pure, spiritual, unborn, undecaying, imperishable and universal spirit, which is one with Vasudeva (God) [the same concept of John 1:1 in describing the Word with God], abandoned his mortal body, and the condition of the threefold equalities [a term used for the same concept of the Christian Trinity] (Vishnu Purana, p. 612). As it the plagiarism has not been proven satisfactorily, one of the titles of Chrishna is "Pardoner of sins," another is "Liberator from the Serpent of death" (Prog. Relig. Ideas, vol. I, p. 72).

The monk Georgius, in his Tibetinum Alphabetum (p. 203) drew the character of a crucified god who was worshiped in Nepal. These crucifixes were to be seen at the corners of roads like the burma shave signs long ago that said "Jesus saves". The monk Georgius called this god Indra.

P. Andrada la Crozius, one of the first Europeans who went to Nepal and Thibet, in speaking of the god whom they worshipped there...Indra...tells us that they said "**he spilt his blood for the salvation of the human race, and that he was pierced through the body with nails**" [remember this is long before Jesus ever existed]. He further says that, although they do not say he suffered the penalty of the cross, yet they find, nevertheless, figures of it in their books (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. ii. P. 118).

What you need to know is that although the nations of Europe have changed their religions during the past eighteen centuries, the Hindoo has not done so, except very partially. The religious creeds, rites, customs, and habits of thought of the Hindus generally, have altered little since the day of Manu, 500 years B. C. (Prof. Monier Williams, Indian Wisdom, p. iv). This means that the concepts we are reading predated Jesus and by over 500-800 years at least and served as a pattern for the crucified representative man of the orient that we find recorded thought the Eastern nations. We find the same story in the New Testament. This should not surprise you. What is of major importance is the absence of such a story from a group of literature...the Jewish Scriptures. The reason is very plain...God sent His revelation to Israel as they were to be a light to these Gentile nations which all have in one way or the other an adaptation of Sun Worship with its hanged/crucified representative man. That is why the Jews have not and will never accept the Jesus' myth for that is what it is.

Answer for yourself: Can anyone wonder why the Jews will not believe the "stores" about Jesus in the New Testament?

In India, in the South at Tanjore, and in the North, at Oude or Ayiondia, was found the **worship of the crucified god Bal-li**. This god, who was believed to have been an incarnation of Vishnu, was represented with holes in his hands and side (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. i. pp. 147).

The incarnate god Buddha, although said to have expired not on a tree but at the foot of a tree, is nevertheless described as a suffering Savior, who, "**when his mind was moved by pity (for the human race) gave his life like grass for the sake of others**" (Max Muller, Science of Religion, p. 224).

Matt 20:28

28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

John 10:11

11 I am the good shepherd: the good shepherd giveth his life for the sheep.

A hymn, addressed to Buddha could just as easily be sung to Jesus:

"Persecutions without end, revilings and many prisons, death and murder, these has thou suffered with love and patience, to secure the happiness of mankind, forgiving thine executioners" (Lilly, Buddhism, p. 93).

Buddha was called the **"Great Physician"** (Bunson, Angel-Messiah, p. 20), the **"Savior of the World"** (Ibid., p. 20, 25, 35; Prog. Relig. Ideas, vol. i. p. 247; Huc's Travels, vol. i. pp. 326, 327, and almost any work on Buddhism), the **"Blessed One"** (Bunson, Angel-Messiah, p. 20), the **"God among Gods"** (Johnson, Oriental Religions, p. 604), the **"Anointed,"** or the **"Christ"** (Ibid.), the **"Messiah"** (Ibid.), the **"Only Begotten"** (Ibid.), etc. Remember again this was long, long before Jesus.

Buddha is likewise described as sacrificing his life to wash away the offenses of mankind and thereby to make them partakers of the kingdom of heaven (Cambridge Key, vol. i. p. 118). Referencing New Testament passages to show the similarity would take too much space but you are most likely well aware that this topic occupies a lot of space in the New Testament.

As a spirit in the fourth heaven, he resolves to give up "all the glory, in order to be born into the world," "to rescue all men from their misery and every future consequence of it." He vows "to deliver all men, who are left as it were without a Savior" (Bunson, Angel-Messiah, p. 20).

Most are familiar with Paul's account in Philippians where he speaks of Jesus emptying himself of his godliness as he takes upon himself frail humanity. In Seminary we called this the "Great Kenosis" passage...kenosis is Greek for empty.

Phil 2:6-8

6 Who, being in the form of God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God:

7 But made himself of no reputation, and took upon him the form of a servant, and was made in the likeness of men:

8 And being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, and became obedient unto death, even the death of the cross.

While in the realms of heaven, and when about to descend upon the earth to be incarnated as a man, Buddha said: "I am now about to assume a body; not for the sake of gaining wealth, or enjoying the pleasures of sense, but I am about to descend and be born, among men, simply to give peace and rest to all flesh; to remove all sorrows and grief from the world" (Beal, Hist. Buddha, p. 33).

M. l'Abbe Huc says: "In the eyes of the Buddhists, this personage (Buddha) is sometimes a man and sometimes a god, or rather both one and the other...a divine incarnation, a man-god, who came into the world to enlighten men, **to redeem them**, and to indicate to them the way of safety. This idea of **redemption by a divine incarnation** is so general and popular among the Buddhists, that during our travels in Upper Asia we everywhere found it expressed in a neat formula. If we addressed to a Mongol or a Thibetan the question "Who is Buddah?" he would immediately reply: "The Savior of Men!" (Huc's Travels, vol. i. pp. 326,327).

According to Prof. Max Muller, Buddha is reported as saying: "Let all the sins that were committed in this world fall on me, that the world may be delivered" (Muller, Hist. Sanscrit Literature, p. 80).

Answer for yourself: Can a Christian doubt that these Gentile sun gods, or Buddah, or even Chrishna for that matter, was the "TYPE" of the Savior of the World to which Jesus was made to fit by the writers of the New Testament?

The people of India are no strangers to the doctrine of **original sin**. It is their invariable belief that **man is a fallen being**. This is admitted by them from time immemorial (Maurice, Indian Antiquities, vol. v. p. 95, and

Williams, Hinduism, p. 214). And what we have seen concerning their beliefs in Chrishna and Buddha unmistakably shows a belief in a **divine Savior, who redeems man**, and takes upon himself the sins of the world; so that "Buddha paid it all, all to him is due" (Prog. Relig. Ideas, vol. ii. P. 86). It is said of Buddha: "He in mercy left paradise, and come down to earth, because he was filled with compassion for the sins and miseries of mankind. He sought to lead them into better paths, and took their sufferings upon himself, that he might expiate their crimes and mitigate their punishment that they must otherwise inevitably undergo. The object of his mission on earth was to instruct those who were straying from the right path, **expiate the sins of mortals by his own sufferings**, and produce for them a happy entrance into another existence by obedience to his precepts and prayers in his name. They always speak of him as one with God from all eternity. His most common title is "The Savior of the World" (Ibid., vol. i. p. 247).

By now you should be understanding that the Sun myths were long in place and were being told over and over again from nation to nation and the similarities are astounding.

There truly is nothing new under the sun (forgive the pun)!

Shalom.



EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #4

The idea of redemption through the sufferings and death of a Divine Savior, is to be found in almost all the Gentile nations of antiquity. For example, let's begin with the nations of the East, in particular the ancient religions of China. One of their five sacred volumes, called the Y-King, says, in speaking of Tien, the "Holy One": "The Holy One will unite in himself all the virtues of heaven and earth. By his justice the world will be re-established in the ways of righteousness. He will labor and suffer much. He must pass the great torrent, whose waves shall enter into his soul, **but he alone can offer up to the Lord a sacrifice worthy of him**" (Prog. Relig. Ideas, vol. i. p. 211).

An ancient commentator says: "The common people sacrifice their lives to gain bread; the philosophers to gain reputation; the nobility to perpetuate their families. The Holy One (Tien) does not seek himself, but the good of others. He dies to save the world" (Ibid.).

I cannot read the above without thinking of the Gospel of John.

John 3:16

16 For God so loved the world, that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life. (KJV)

John 5:30

30 I can of mine own self do nothing. I hear, I judge: and my judgment is just; because I seek not mine own will, but the will of the Father which hath sent me. (KJV)

John 8:50

50 And I seek not mine own glory: there is one that seeketh and judgeth. (KJV)

Tien, the Holy One, is always spoken of as one with God, existing with him from all eternity, "before anything was made". Again John comes to mind.

John 1:1-3

1 In the beginning was the Word, and the Word was with God, and the Word was God.

2 The same was in the beginning with God.

3 All things were made by him; and without him was not any thing made that was made.

Many will think this is just coincidence. So let us continue to see what we can find.

THE CRUCIFIED "SAVIORS" OF PAGANISM

Osiris and Horus, the Egyptian virgin-born gods, suffered death (Renouf, Religions of Ancient Egypt, p. 178). Mr. Bonwick, speaking of Osiris, says: "He is one of the Saviors or deliverers of humanity, to be found in almost all lands" [only his name was changed from country to country]. "In his efforts to do good, he encounters evil; in struggling with that he is overcome; he is killed" (Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, p. 155).

Alexander Murray says: "The Egyptian Savior Osiris was gratefully regarded as the great exemplar of self-sacrifice, in **giving his life for others**" (Murray, Manual of Mythology, p. 348).

The writers of the New Testament carry on this same idea.

Matt 20:28

28 Even as the Son of man came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many.

1 Tim 2:6

6 Who gave himself a ransom for all, to be testified in due time.

Sir. J. G. Wilkinson says of Osiris: "The sufferings and death of Osiris was the great Mystery of the Egyptian religion, and some traces of it are perceptible among other peoples of antiquity (remember Sun Worship?). His being the Divine Goodness, and the abstract idea of "good," his manifestation upon earth (like a Hindu god), his death and resurrection, and his office as judge of the dead in a future state, **look like the early revelation of a future manifestation of the deity converted into a mythological fable**" (Rawlinson, Herodotus, vol. ii. P. 171).

Horus was also called "**The Savior.**" "As Horus Sneb, he is the Redeemer. He is the **Lord of Life and the Eternal One**" (Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, P. 185). He is also called "**The Only-Begotten**" (Mysteries of Adonai, p. 88).

Attis, who was called the "**Only Begotten Son**" (Knight, Ancient Art and Mythology, p. xxii.) and "**Savior,**" was worshipped by the Phrygians (who were regarded as one of the oldest races of Asia Minor). He was represented by them as a **man tied to a tree, at the foot of which was a lamb** (Dupuls, Origin of Religious Belief, p. 255). He is also characterized as a man nailed to the tree, or stake, for we find Lactantius making this Apollo of Miletus (anciently, the greatest and the most flourishing city of Ionia, in Asia Minor) say that : "He was a mortal according to the flesh; wise in miraculous works; but **being arrested by an armed force** by command of the Chaldean **judges (Sadducee like)**, he suffered a death made bitter with **nails and stakes**" (Dupuls, Origin of Religious Belief, vol. ii).

In this god of the Phrygians, we again have the same myth of the **crucified Savior of Paganism.**

By referring to Mrs. Jameson's History of Our Lord in Art, it can easily be seen that a common mode of representing a crucifixion was that of a man, tied with cords by the hands and feet, to an upright beam or stake.

Tammuz, or Adonis, the Syrian Adonai (Lord) was another **virgin-born god**, who suffered for mankind, and who had the title of "**Savior.**" The accounts of his death are conflicting, just as it is with almost all of the so-called Saviors of mankind (including the Christian Savior). As we progress we shall see that the reason for such variation is the multiple variety of Sun Myths that deal with the dying of the sun. Every nation had their own spin to the story it seems, but the basic story was the same.

As if this was not enough evidence and facts from history and the religions of the world to arouse more than an idle curiosity in the Christian believer, the ancients who honored Tammuz and Adonis as their Lord and Savior also celebrated a feast in commemoration of his death (it was their Lord's Supper). An image, intended as a

representation of their Lord, was laid on a bed or bier, and bewailed in mournful hymns just as the Roman Catholics do at the present day in their "Good Friday" mass.

During this ceremony the priest murmured: "Trust ye in your Lord, for the pains which he endured, our salvation have procured" (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. ii. p. 114).

The Rev. Dr. Parkhurst, in his Hebrew Lexicon, after referring to what we have just stated above, says: "His other name, Adonis, is almost the very Hebrew Adonai or Lord, a well-known title of Christ."

Prometheus was a crucified Savior. He was "an immortal god, a friend of the human race, **"who does not shrink even from sacrificing himself for their salvation."**

The tragedy of the crucifixion of Prometheus, written by Eschylus, was acted in Athens five hundred years before the Christian Era, and is by many considered to be the most ancient dramatic poem now in existence. The plot was derived from materials even at that time of an infinitely remote antiquity. Nothing was ever so exquisitely calculated to work upon the feelings of the spectators. "His (Divine Sufferer) sorrows were endured for their salvation." The majesty of his silence, whilst the ministers of an offended god were nailing him by the hands and feet to Mount Caucasus, could only be equaled by the modesty with which he relates, "while hanging with arms extended in the form of a cross," his services to the human race, which had brought on him that horrible crucifixion (Eschylus, Prometheus Chained, Harper and Bros., N.Y.). In the myth relating to Prometheus, he always appears as the friend of the human race, suffering in its behalf the most fearful tortures. More than strange is the unique story of Prometheus' friend, Oceanus, the fisherman, as his name Petros indicates. This Oceanus tries unsuccessfully to influence Prometheus to not die for mankind, but being unable to prevail on him to make his peace with Jupiter, by throwing the cause of human redemption out of his hands, forsook him and flew. Now contrast this with Matt. 16:22

Matt 16:22

22 Then Peter took him, and began to rebuke him, saying, Be it far from thee, Lord: this shall not be unto thee.

None remained to be witness of his dying agonies but the chorus of ever-amiable and every-faithful which also bewailed and lamented him

Luke 23:27

27 And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him.

In the words of Justin Martyr: "Suffering was common to all of the sons of Jove." They were called the **"Slain Ones," "Saviors," "Redeemers,"** etc.

Bacchus, the offspring of Jupiter and Semele, was called the **"Savior"** (Knight, Anct. Art and Mythology, p. 98) He was called the **"Only Begotten Son,"** the **"Slain One"** (Knight, Ancient Art and Mythology, p. xxii), the **"Sin Bearer"** (Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, p. 169), the **"Redeemer"** (Dupis, Origin of Religious Belief, p. 135), etc. Evil having spread itself over the earth, through the inquisitiveness of Pandor, the Lord of the gods is begged to come to the relief of mankind. Jupiter lends a willing ear to the entreaties, "and wishes that his son should be the redeemer of the misfortunes of the world; The Bacchus Savior. He promises to the earth a Liberator..and the universe shall worship him, and shall praise in songs his blessings." In order to execute his purpose, Jupiter overshadows the beautiful young maiden, the virgin Semele, who becomes the mother of the Redeemer."

"It is I (says the lord Bacchus to mankind), who guides you; it is I who protects you, and who saves you; I who am Alpha and Omega." (quoted on the monument of Bacchus)

Hercules, the son of Zeus, was called **"The Savior"** (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. i. p. 322). The words "Hercules the Savior" were engraven on ancient coins and monuments (Celtic Druids, Taylor, Diegesis, p. 153). He was also called **"The Only Begotten,"** and the **"Universal Word."** He was re-absorbed into God. He was said by

Ovid to be the sun "Self-produced," the Generator and Ruler of all things, and the Father of time (Mysteries of Adonai, p. 91, and Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. i. p. 322).

Esculapis was distinguished by the epithet **"The Savior"** (Taylor, Diegesis, p. 153). The Temple erected to his memory in the city of Athens was called: **"The Temple of the Savior."**

Apollo was distinguished by the epithet **"The Savior"** as well (Dupuis, Origin of Religious Belief, p. 264). In a hymn to Apollo he is called: "The willing Savior of distressed mankind" (Monumental Christianity, p. 186).

Serapis was called "The Savior" (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. ii. p. 15). **He was considered by Hadrian, the Roman emperor (117-138 A.D.), and the Gentiles, to be the peculiar god of the Christians** (Giles, Hebrew and Christian Records, vol. II. p. 86). A cross was found under the ruins of his temple in Alexandria in Egypt (Anacalypsis, vol. ii. p. 15). And notice also that much of the New Testament was written from Alexandria, Egypt along with the translation of the LXX which is corrupted in many places when compared with the Palestinian Masoretic text. It is very evident that the pictures of Christ Jesus, as we know them today, are simply the pictures of some of the Pagan gods. A cursory study of religious art in the early days of Christianity and before will show you the resemblances. One should expect that Jesus of Nazareth to resemble a Jew and have Jewish features and these early pictures do not betray such a fact.

Mithras, who was **"Mediator between God and man"** (Dunlap, Spirit History, pp. 237, 242) was also called **"The Savior."** He was the peculiar god of the Persians, who believed that he had, by his sufferings, worked their salvation, and on this account he was called their "Savior" (Higgins, Anacalypsis, vol. ii, p. 20). He was also called **"the Logos"** (Dunlop, Son of Man, p. 20). According to the most ancient tradition of the East-Iranians recorded in the end-Avesta, the God of Light (Ormuzd) communicated his mysteries to some men through his **"Word"** (Bunsen, Angel-Messiah, p. 75).

The Persians believed that they were tainted with "original sin" owing to the fall of their first parents who were tempted by the evil one in the form of a serpent (Wake, Phallism, p. 47).

They considered the law-given **Zoroaster** to be also a Divine Messenger, sent to redeem men from their evil ways, and they always worshipped his memory. To this day his followers mention him with the greatest reverence, calling him **"The Immortal Zoroaster," "The Blessed Zoroaster," "The First-Born of the Eternal One,"** etc. (Prog. Relig. Ideas, vol. i. pp. 258, 259).

"In the life of Zoroaster the common mythos is apparent. He was born in innocence, of an immaculate conception, of a ray of Divine Reason. As soon as he was born, the glory arising from his body enlightened the room, and he laughed at his mother. He was called a Splendid Light from the Tree of Knowledge, and, in find, he or his soul was hung upon a tree, and this was the Tree of Knowledge" (Malcolm, Hist. Persia, vol. i. pp. p. 494; Nimrod, vol. ii. P. 31; Anacalypsis, vol. il. P. 649).

How much this resembles "the mystery which hath been hid from ages and from generations, but now is made manifest to his saints" (Col. 1:26).

Hermes was called **"The Savior."** On the altar of Pepi (B.C. 3500) are to be found prayers to Hermes... **"He who is the good Savior"** (Bonwick, Egyptian Belief, p. 102). He was also called **"The Logos."** The church fathers, Hippolytus, Justin Martyr, and Plutarch assert that the Logos is Hermes (Dunlap, Son of Man, p. 30). The term "Logos" is Greek and signifies literally **"Word"** (John 1:1). He was also "The Messenger of God" (Bell, Pantheon, vol. ii, pp. 69-71).

Dr. Inman says: "There are few words which strike more strongly upon the senses of in inquirer into the nature of ancient faiths, than **Salvation** and **Savior**. Both were used long before the birth of Christ, and they are still common among those who never heard of Jesus, or of that which is known among us as the Gospels" (Inman, Ancient Faiths, vol. ii. p. 652).

Besides the titles of "God's First-Born," "Only Begotten," the "Mediator," the "Shepherd," the "Advocate,"

the **"Paraclete or Comforter," the "Son of God," the "Logos,"** etc., being applied to heathen virgin-born gods, before the time assigned for the birth of Jesus of Nazareth, we have also that of **Christ and Jesus**. This terminology can be studied out by you in detail if you acquire copies of Bunsen, Angel-Messiah, p. 119, Knight, Ancient Art and Mythology, pp. xxii and 98, Dunlap, Son of Man, p. 71, and Spirit History, pp. 183, 205, 206, 249, Bible for Learners, vol. ii. p. 25, Isis Unveiled, vol. iii pp. 195, 237, 516, etc.

THE GENTILE'S SAVIOR GODS CALLED "CHRISTS"

We now turn our attention to the many uses of the term "Christ" as used long before the time of Jesus of Nazareth and how they were previously connected with the Gentile's "Saviors".

We not continue our study by examining the terms for other Gentiles Savior-gods of which most will be unfamiliar. I am referring tot the use of the terms "Christ" as it was applied to the representative redeemer men that long predated Jesus of Nazareth.

Cyrus, King of Persia, was called the "Christ," or the "Anointed of God" (Bunsen, Bible Chronology, p. 5, Keys of St. Peter, p. 125). As Dr. Giles says, "Christ" is "a name having no spiritual signification, and importing nothing more than an ordinary surname" (Giles, Hebrew and Christian Records, p. 64, vol. ii). The worshippers of Serapis were called "Christians," and those devoted to Serapis were called "Bishops of Christ" long before the birth of Jesus of Nazareth (Ibid. p. 86; Taylor, Diegesis, pp. 202-206, 407). **This fact is amazing. Eusebius, the ecclesiastical historian says, that the names of "Jesus" and "Christ," were both known and honored among the ancients** (Eusebius, Eccl. History, lib. 1. Ch. iv.).

Mithras was called the **"Anointed" or the "Christ;"** (Dunlap, Son of Man, p. 78) and **Horus, Mano, Mithras, Bel-Minor, Iao, Adoni, etc.,** were each of them **"God of Light," "Light of the World," the "Anointed," or the "Christ"** (Ibid. p. 39).

It is said that Peter called Yeshua "the Christ," whereupon "he straightway charged him (the disciples), and commanded them to tell no man "that thing" (Luke 4:21).

The title of "Christ" or "the Anointed," was held by the kings of Israel. "Touch not my Christ and do my people no harm," says the Psalmist (Psalm 105:15).

The tern "Christ" was applied to religious leaders, leaders of factions, necromancers or wonder-workers, etc. This is seen by the passage in Matthew, where the writer says: "There shall arise false Christs and false prophets, and shall show great signs and wonders, insomuch that, if it were possible, they shall deceive the very elect" (Matt. 24:24).

The virgin-born Chrishna and Buddha were incarnations of Vishnu, called Avatars. An Avatar is an Angel-Messiah, a God-man, a Christ; for the word "Christ" is from the Greek "Christos," an Anointed One, a Messiah.

Let us continue our study in the veneration of "crosses" by the non-Jews in their worship and portrayal of their Savior gods.



EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #5

You will probably find this next piece of information amazing. The holy Father Minucius Felix, in his *Octavius*, written as late as 211 A.D., indignantly **resents the supposition that the sign of the cross should be considered exclusively as a Christian symbol**, and represents his advocate of the Christian government as retorting on an infidel opponent. His words are: "As for the adoration of **crosses which you (Pagans) object against us (Christians)**, I must tell you, that we neither adore crosses nor desire them; you it is, ye Pagans.....who are the most likely people to adore wooden crosses...for what else are your ensigns, flags, and standards , **but crosses gilt and beautiful. Your (speaking of the Pagans) victorious trophies not only represent a simple cross, but a cross with a man upon it"** (*Octavius*, c. xxix).

In this Christian's defense of his faith and theological doctrines he admits that the Pagans also have crucified saviors on crosses. When I first ran across such admissions by early Church fathers I was puzzled and disturbed to my very core. I had to find out why Pagans had the same religious belief system that my Christian forefathers did.

Answer for yourself: How could Christianity be the truth for the world when the world already had the Christian crucified Savior? Where did the Pagans get the same ideas which were held sacred by Gentile Christians let alone get them hundreds and thousands of years before the revelation of Jesus of Nazareth?

YOU ARE NOT PREPARED FOR THE INEVITABLE TRUTH

I was to discover through many tears that my whole Christian religious belief system could be traced to Sun Worship and it's many variegated forms. The next years of my study were both insightful but the hardest years of my life. The results of my inquiries yielded tons of insurmountable proofs and facts to substantiate the plagiarism of Sun Worship by the Gentile Christian Church. To make matters worse it would be these Gentile Christians which would craft the document called the New Testament which is filled with Sun Worship as masqueraded through the events of the life of Yeshua. **These "sun myths" literally became personified in the personage of Jesus of Nazareth.** Later such "sun myths," because they were connected with the life of Yeshua, became religious "dogmas" and "doctrines." We now look more deeply into such myths as seen in the veneration of crosses by the Christian Church over the ages.

CHRISTIAN SUN WORSHIP....THE ATONEMENT OF THE SUN... AND THE CROSS

The above declaration in the writings of Father M. Felix is a miracle. It is a miracle that it was not destroyed by Rome in the early ages of the Christian movement. Its existence is probably owing to an oversight of the destroyers of all evidences against the Gentile Christian religion that could be had. The practice of the Romans, here alluded to, of carrying a cross with a man on it, or, in other words, a **crucifix**, has evidently been concealed

from us by the careful destruction of such of their works as alluded to it. The priests had everything their own way for centuries, and to destroy what was evidence against their claims was a very simple matter.

It is very evident that this celebrated Christian Father alludes to some Gentile mystery, of which the prudence of his successors has deprived us. When we compare this with the fact that for centuries after the time assigned for the birth of Christ Jesus, he was not represented as a man on a cross, and that the Christians did not have such a thing as a **crucifix**, we are inclined to think that the effigies of a black or **dark-skinned crucified man**, which were to be seen in many places in Italy even during the last century, may have had something to do with it (Anacalypsis, vol. ii. p. 110).

While speaking of a "**cross with a man on it**" as being carried by the Pagan Romans as a standard, we might mention the fact related by Arrian the historian, that the troops of Porus, in their war with Alexander the Great, carried on their standards **the figure of a man on a cross** (Anacalypsis, vol. ii. p. 118). Here is evidently the **crucifix** standard again.

Tertullian, a Christian Father of the second and third centuries, writing to the Pagans, says: "**The origin of your (Pagans) god is derived from figures moulded on a cross**. All those rows of images on your standards are the appendages of crosses; those hangings on your standards and banners are the robes of crosses" (Apol. C. 16; Ad Nationes, c. xii.).

We have it then, on the authority of a Christian Father, as late as 211 A.D., that the **Christians "neither adored crosses nor desired them,"** but that the Pagans "adored crosses," and not that alone, but "**a cross with a man upon it.**" Jesus, in those days, nor for centuries after, was **NOT represented as a man on a cross. He was represented as a lamb**, and the adoration of the crucifix, by the Christians, was a later addition to their religion.

WHO WAS THIS CRUCIFIED MAN WHOM THE PAGANS ADORED BEFORE AND AFTER THE TIME OF JESUS?

Answer for yourself: Who did the crucifix represent?

If you have read these articles you now know. It was "the Savior crucified for the salvation of mankind," long before the Christian Era, whose effigies were to be seen in many places all over Italy and the world. These Pagan crucifixes were either destroyed, corrupted, or adopted; the latter was the case with many ancient paintings of the Bambino (the baby in his mother's arms named differently in almost every culture world-wide). Christians called the mother with child "Mary and baby Jesus." In Babylon it was called "Semiramis and Tammuz." You get the picture. On these paintings we often find the words "**Deo Soli.**" Now, these two words can never apply to Christ Jesus. He was not Deus Solus, in any sense, according to the idiom of the Latin language, and the Romish faith. Whether we construe the words "the only God," or "God alone," they are equally heretical. No priest, in any age of the church, would have thought of putting them there; **but finding them there**, they tolerated them.

In the "Celtic Druids," Mr. Higgins describes a crucifix, a lamb, and an elephant, which was cut upon the "fire tower," so called at Brechin, a town of Forfarshire, in Scotland. Although they appeared to be of very ancient date, he supposed, at that time, that they were modern, and most likely belonged to Christianity. He would later change his mind and write: "I now date the modern date of the tower, for we have, over and over again, seen the crucified man before Christ. We have also found "The Lamb that taketh away the sins of the world,: among the Carnutes of Gaul, before the time of Christ; and when I contemplate these...I am induced to doubt my former conclusions. All these superstitions must have come from India."

On one of the Irish "round towers" is to be seen a crucifix of unmistakable Asiatic Origin (Lundy, Monumental Christianity, pp. 253, 254, 255).

Answer for yourself: As you contemplate what is being shown to you, and as God watches the uncovering of lies

before your face, are you now more determined than ever to study your faith in detail and then compare it with Biblical Judaism, the faith of Yeshua of Nazareth? What is truth? Now do you think as a Christian you have it?



EXAMINING THE CRUCIFIXION OF JESUS AND PARALLELS TO CRUCIFIED SUN-GODS #6

Not forgetting what we have already learned, if we turn to the New World, we shall find, strange though it may appear, that the ancient Mexicans and Peruvians worshipped a crucified Savior as did those on the opposite side of the globe. This is utterly amazing considering in those days the limited travel and communication on this planet. Yet there is unmistakably a common denominator behind all these "crucified representative Saviors" that existed thousands of years before the time of Jesus of Nazareth.

This "crucified Savior" of the New World was the virgin-born Quetzalcoate whose crucifixion is represented in the paintings of the "Codex Borgianus," and the "Codex Vaticanus."

These paintings illustrate the religious opinions of the ancient Mexicans, and were copied from the hieroglyphics found in Mexico. The Spaniards destroyed nearly all the books, ancient monuments and paintings which they could find; had it not been for this, much more regarding the religion of the ancient Mexicans would have been handed down to us. Many chapters were also taken, by the Spanish authorities, from the writings of the first historians who wrote on ancient Mexico. All manuscripts had to be inspected previous to being published. Anything found among these heathens resembling the religion of the Christians, was destroyed when possible (Kingsborough, Mexican Antiquities, vol. vi. pp. 165 and 179).

The first Spanish monks who went to Mexico were surprised to find the crucifix among the heathen inhabitants, and upon inquiring what it meant, were told that it was a representation of Bacob (Quetzalcoate), the Son of God, who was put to death by Eopuco. They said that he was placed on a ben of wood, with his arms stretched out, and that he died there (Kingsborough, Mexican Antiquities, vol. vi. p. 166).



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #1

If you are a Christian this is the most important piece of information you will have ever read. I behoove you to read the whole article if you want to understand the death of Yeshua as God intended. The facts presented speak for themselves. I pray you will quietly and prayerfully speak to the Father as you read this most enlightening articles. My prayers and blessings to you.

As a Christian you have been told your whole life that two great objectives were accomplished by Jesus in his mission to this world.

- **The removal of the curse under which mankind labored as a result of the disobedience and fall**
- **The restoration of men to the image and fellowship of God.**

Both of these were essential to salvation as taught by Gentile Christianity. Christianity teaches that the work of Christ in reconciling God and men is called "the" Atonement; and this doctrine lies at the very heart of the Christian system. Sadly few understand correctly this very important doctrine, the origin of Christianity's claims, nor can the Biblical teaching on Atonement be understood correctly without a proper understanding of the Hebraic roots from which it came.

We are altogether dependent on Old Testament Scripture and Jewish writings for our knowledge concerning the doctrine of the Atonement and can know only what God has seen fit to reveal concerning it.

What most don't know is that when one encounters teachings on Atonement in the New Testament, which was collected and altered repeatedly by the Gentile Church, one is reading the "Gentile pagan accounts of Atonements from mystery religions" and and not "fulfillments" of Old Testament Scripture!

Our present purpose in this series of articles is to give a systematized account of what the Jewish Scriptures, the Bible Yeshua used. the Palestinian Masoretic Text, the Tanakh, teach concerning Atonement, and to show that this fits in perfectly with the longings and aspirations of an enlightened spiritual nature.

A CHRISTIAN'S UNDERSTANDING OF THE NEW TESTAMENT IS IMPOSSIBLE WITHOUT A THOUGH UNDERSTANDING OF THE OLD TESTAMENT

First of all you have to have the correct text. The Christian's Old Testament is different from the Jewish Masoretic text in over 2000 places. This should concern you immensely! If you want the facts check out: <http://geocities.com/faithofyeshua>. You should demand a translation and not a free creationism as

doctored by non-Jews, who over the centuries, conformed the faith and writings of the Jews to suit their pagan backgrounds. Enough said. If you have been reading our materials we have made this most plain over the years. Now to the purpose at hand.

In one of Paul's most condensed and fundamental statements of Christian teaching we read: "For I delivered unto you first of all that which also I received: that Christ (Messiah) died for our sins according to the Scriptures; and that He was buried; and that He hath been raised on the third day according to the Scriptures," I Cor. 15:3.

Answer for yourself: Even in the corrupt Old Testaments in the Christian Bibles, can you find where the Old Testament prophecies that Yeshua was to die for sin and that he was to be buried and raised on the 3rd day?

What? You cannot? No wonder; it is not there anywhere! And please don't read into Isa. 53 the concept of an "individual" when the author from chapter 40 on through chapter 66 deals with a "corporate, collective, and national" Suffering Servant and never one individual. If you do so, then understand that you invalidate completely what Isaiah intended we learn from the passage. Such is reading into the text your pre-formed theology. Let us not do that. We are supposed to believe what we can draw out of the text. The text must determine our beliefs. Such is exegesis. I recommend exegesis as you can see and because of my Christian background I must fight daily to limit my eisegesis as much as possible because so much error is yet burned into my subconscious. We must struggle and fight for the truth. Such makes one Israel.

IF YOU HAD A GOOD KNOWLEDGE OF THE OLD TESTAMENT THEN YOU WOULD NOT BE MISLED SO EASILY BY THE NEW TESTAMENT

First of all understand that the word "Christ" means Messiah in Hebrew. So according to Paul, in the New Testament, his "gospel" is saying that the Messiah died for our sins.

Answer for yourself: Does the Old Testament and Jewish Scriptures teach and prepare Israel to prepare for and accept a Messiah who comes to die for their sins? No it does not in fact; it teaches just the opposite and this is where the problem lies.

You might not be able to answer with Old Testament Scripture the above question but you will be able soon enough if you continue to study our articles. The Gospel of John in the New Testament states that the "Word became flesh," meaning by most accounts that Jesus, the Messiah, came from Heaven in the form of flesh. Christianity answers the above dilemma two ways: one, there was a time the flesh was "not the Word" and a time when the "Word became flesh" in the Virgin Birth. Without going into detail, the idea which was understood and believed by the first Jewish followers concerning Yeshua; that of him "becoming" Messiah at his immersion is just another proof that the Virgin Birth teaching is incorrect. If you would like to have the detailed teachings exposing the errors in the Virgin Birth teaching request them from Bet Emet Ministries and we will be glad to see you get them. **So, important for your understanding as we study atonement is that Jesus became "the" Messiah (Messiah means anointed and we have record of his anointing "without measure" when he was 30 years old at the Jordan).** You and I dear one are anointed with measure, but Yeshua was anointed "without measure". **You would expect one to fulfill the Messianic hope of Israel to be so equipped. Incidentally, this is exactly what the earliest Jewish followers of Yeshua/Jesus believed; namely that Jesus is the Messiah, and became the Messiah from anointing without measure at the Jordan. Such were called the Ebionites and their writings are available today as well as the records of the early Church historians which reveal to us what the earliest beliefs were concerning Jesus before being changed by the Roman Church in the fourth century and following.** It is not my intention to explain in this article why the prophecies of the Jewish Scriptures were not fulfilled in Yeshua nor deal with the fictional creations of "false-fulfilled" passages in the New Testament in this article. We have that

information available to those who would desire it at: <http://www.faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>.

NOW LETS THINK ...

Now let me ask you a question that goes to the very foundation of the core of our beliefs about salvation.

Answer for yourself: Should we not rather try to understand Paul to say that “Christ died because of our sins” instead of “for our sins?”

Critical for our understanding is if Christ’s death:

- Was the result of our sins or if his death atoned for sins?
- If Christ’s death atoned for ALL our sins or if his death atoned only for PART of our sins (Yom Kippur/The Day of Atonement teaches us the truth in this regard), or did his death NOT atone for any of our sins?
- If Christ’s death or rather his life (life is in the blood which ended at his death and the shedding of his blood) atoned for sins, then what implication does one's "life" have for personal atonement of sin?

Before we get to the very heart of the issue we must come to a better understanding of the sacrificial system in order to correctly consider if Jesus’ death can be understood as a proper sacrifice within the Law and the dynamics within it that affects the forgiveness of sin.

LAWS OF THE SACRIFICE

The terminology used with regard to the patriarchal age is that of the Torah as a whole; it is unlikely that the same words in Genesis mean something different in the other Books of Moses. Thus, Cain and Abel each brought a "gift" (*minhah*; Gen. 4:4f.), which was usually of a cereal nature as brought by Cain (Lev. 2). Notice this is not a sin offering! Noah offered up a burnt offering (“olah”; Gen. 8:20ff.) and the pleasing odor of the sacrifice is stressed. Job is also depicted as making burnt offerings periodically (Job 1:5) and for specific purposes (Job 42:7–9). The burnt offerings, signifying complete surrender to God, were by far the most frequent sacrifices at the Israelite sanctuary. Again these offerings by Noah and Job were not "sin" offerings and only showed the complete devotion and surrender of the "offerer's" heart to God as he demonstrated and testified to his relationship with God through such "gifts".

I need to repeat the last statement as it will have major significance as you continue to read.

These burnt offerings [olahs] as seen in Cain, Able, Noah, and Job only showed the complete devotion and surrender of the "offerer's" heart to God as he demonstrated and testified to his relationship with God through such "gifts".

The Patriarchs normally are said to have "called on the name of the Lord," e.g., Abraham (Gen. 12:8, 13–4; 21:33) and Isaac (Gen. 26:25). The association of this phrase with the building of an altar shows that it refers to the approach to God through sacrifice. With Jacob the naming of the specific altar is stressed (Gen. 33:20; 35:7). Once Abraham is said to have offered an “olah” (Gen. 22:13) but Jacob (Gen. 31:54; 46:1) offered “zevachim”. Again these were NOT "sin" offerings NOR were they intended for Atonement.

Now let us look at "offerings" and "sacrifices" from Moses to Samuel. The covenant sacrifice inaugurating the relationship between the Lord and His people (Ex. 24:3–8) is not paralleled by specific rituals in the Mosaic liturgy. Burnt and peace offerings were first offered and then the blood from them (not from a sin offering) was thrown half against the altar and half upon the people. In the land of Canaan the Israelites made sacrifices at various places, e.g., at Bochim (Judg. 2:1–5) and Ophrah (Judg. 6:24–26). The human sacrifice of Jephthah's

daughter (Judg. 11:30–40) was hardly normative; instead it is pointed out as evidence of Israel's sad spiritual state at that time. The main center for sacrificial ritual was at Shiloh (I Sam 1:3ff.), where faithful Israelites came for an annual festive offering. That the ritual there was highly developed and detailed is proven by the explicit description of malpractice on the part of Eli's sons (I Sam 2:13–17) in taking their portion of the meat before the entrails were burned. However, Shiloh was not the only legitimate place of sacrifice; others included Beth-Shemesh (I Sam 6:14–15), Mizpah (I Sam 7:9), Ramah (I Sam. 7:17; 9:11–24), and Gilgal (I Sam. 10:8; 11:15; 13:9). Family and clan sacrifices were commonplace (I Sam. 16:2–5).

Common to all these instances was "sacrifice" for other reasons than "sin offerings"! This is so very important. What you need to know is that in the Old Testament the first mention of animal sacrifices for "sin offerings" was AFTER the Golden Calf and the sin of idolatry by a people already possessing relational knowledge of the True God

Answer for yourself: Then how did mankind obtain forgiveness of sin up until the Golden Calf and the idolatry associated with it? Surely man sinned and must have been given a way of obtaining atonement prior to the Exodus. Well stay tuned!



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #2

HOW WERE THE SACRIFICES OF THE OLD TESTAMENT TO BE UNDERSTOOD AND INTERPRETED?

Throughout the ages attempts have been made to explain the dynamics involved in the sacrificial system of Israel. Without such an understanding of the Old Testament Sacrificial System the typical Christian is literally "crippled" in his understanding of Atonement. The proposed explanations can be divided into three categories: the symbolic, juridical, and rational.

SYMBOLIC

Philo devoted a treatise to the subject (De Victimis; see Spec. 1:112–256). He pointed out that only domesticated animals and the most gentle birds were suitable for sacrifice and that they had to be free of blemish, which he took as a symbol that the offerers must also be wholesome in body and soul. The Jew had to approach the altar with his soul purged of its passions and viciousness if the sacrifice was to be acceptable (Spec. 1:166/167, 257).

Take notice of the spiritual condition necessary **BEFORE** the sacrifice was to be presented at the altar...his soul had to be purged of sin IF the sacrifice was to be acceptable to God.

The reader needs to understand NOW that there were prior conditions that needed to be met by the sacrificer of the animal BEFORE the sacrifice was to be brought to the altar. Now lets pick up with Philo.

The wicked would be rejected, even if they offered hundreds of sacrifices (Spec. 1:271). The rabbis stated that the sacrificial statutes indicated that God is with the persecuted. The ox is pursued by the lion, the goat by the leopard, and the lamb by the wolf. Therefore God commanded, "Do not offer those that persecute, but rather those that are persecuted" (Lev. R. 27:5). The requirement that fowl be offered with their feathers symbolized that a poor man was not to be despised. Therefore his offering was placed on the altar in its full adornment, despite the nauseating odor normally arising from the burning of feathers (Lev. R. 3:5). Salt, an indispensable ingredient of sacrifice, was symbolic of the moral effect of suffering, which purifies man and causes sins to be forgiven (Ber. 5a). Judah Halevi declared that the fire on the altar was kindled by the will of God as a sign that the people found favor in His sight and that He was accepting their hospitality and offerings (Kuzari 2:26). Samson Raphael Hirsch explained that the Pentateuch required the person to lay his hands upon the head of the sacrifice to indicate that the "hands" that have become morally weakened "support" themselves on the resolution of the future betterment that is expressed by the offering (his commentary to Lev. 1:4). David Hoffmann declared that sacrifices are symbols of man's gratitude to God and his dependence on Him, of the absolute devotion man owes to God, as well as of man's confidence in Him (Introd. to commentary on Lev.

(Heb. ed.), 64–67).

JUDICIAL

The juridical approach is put forward by Ibn Ezra (commentary to Lev. 1:1) and to some extent by Nahmanides (commentary to Lev. 1:9). According to them, the sinner's life is forfeit to God, but by a gracious provision he is permitted to substitute a faultless victim. His guilt (not his sin) is transferred to the offering by the symbolic act of placing his hands on the victim.

The reader should understand RIGHT NOW that this is something new he has never heard in his Christian Church. It was the guilt and not the sin that was transferred to the innocent animal. Now back to Ibn Ezra.

When observing the pouring out of the blood and the burning of the sacrifice, the person should acknowledge that were it not for divine grace he should be the victim, expiating his sin with his own blood and limbs (Nahmanides to Lev. 1:9). Many Christian exegetes adopted this explanation and on it built the whole theological foundation of their Church.

RATIONAL

Quite different is the rational view of sacrifice advocated by Maimonides. He rejected the symbolist position which discovered reasons for the details of the various sacrifices. Those who trouble themselves to discover why one offering should be a lamb, while another is a ram, are "void of sense; they do not remove any difficulties, but rather increase them" (Guide, 3:26). Maimonides held that the sacrificial service was not really of Jewish origin. It was the universal custom among all peoples at the time of Moses to worship by means of sacrifices. Since the Israelites had been brought up in this atmosphere, God realized that they could not immediately completely abandon sacrifice. He therefore limited its application by confining it to one place in the world, with the ultimate intention of weaning them from the debased religious rituals of their idolatrous neighbors.

Answer for yourself: Dear one, did you hear that? God was in time to wean His people from the pagan idolatrous forms of worship that contained animals sacrifice that His people had been influenced by the example of pagan nations? This means that Atonement was to be obtained in other than "blood" and the Old Testament is full of ways by which one can obtain Atonement without "blood"! Please keep reading!

The new service of "confined sacrifice" in one place in the world stressed the existence and unity of God, "without deterring or confusing the minds of the people by the abolition of the service to which they were accustomed and which alone was familiar to them." Maimonides cited the experience of Israel, led not by the shorter way, but by the circuitous route through the land of the Philistines (Ex. 13:17). Likewise, through a circuitous road, Israel was to be led gradually and slowly to a deeper perception of religion and divine worship (Guide, 3:32). He gives the added remarkable parallel that it would be equally incomprehensible for anyone in his generation to suggest that prayer could be offered in thought alone, without the recitation of words.

Abrabanel strengthened the arguments for Maimonides' viewpoint. He explained that only within this framework can it be understood why the Torah limited the sacrificial service to one locality while prayers may be recited in all places (Introd. to his commentary on Lev., 2d). Abrabanel cites a Midrash which stated that the Hebrews had become accustomed to idolatrous sacrifices while in Egypt. To wean them from these idolatrous practices, God commanded, while tolerating the sacrifices that had been practiced by His people as influenced by pagans, that they be offered in one central sanctuary. This was illustrated by the parable of a king who observed that his son loved to eat forbidden foods. The king then decided to serve him these foods daily so that he would ultimately lose his desire for them and forego his evil habits (Lev. R. 22:8). D. Hoffmann later proposed a different explanation for this Midrash, declaring that the king insisted that the son was to eat exclusively at his table so that he would only be served proper food and thus curb his appetite

for forbidden foodstuffs (Intro. to commentary on Lev., p. 61).

The reader should understand that God was going to do a new thing. He was to allow the continuation of these “pagan sacrifices” but He will instill new meaning to them. This will be seen in the development of a unique relationship between the sacrificer and God Himself. You will see how this works when we look deeper into the concept in Leviticus that “the life is in the blood”. God is not concerned about blood, but the life...the soul contained within the blood!

With the destruction of the Temple and the automatic cessation of the sacrificial system, it was laid down that prayer took the place of the sacrifices because such ideas are also taught in the Old Testament. The Shaharit service was regarded as taking the place of the morning tamid and the Minhah service, the afternoon tamid. On all occasions when an additional offering was brought, the Musaf prayer was introduced (Ber. 4:1, 7; 26b). One of the rabbis later declared that prayer was even more efficacious than offerings (Ber. 32b) [remember God was progressively weaning them from animal sacrifices (the physical) with the intent of spiritual sacrifices such as prayer, repentance, almsgiving, etc.]. This is the message of the Prophets!

THE SPIRITUAL DYNAMICS OF SACRIFICE THAT WE JUST DISCUSSED ...SEEN IN DETAIL

When the glory of the Lord had entered the tabernacle in a cloud, God revealed Himself to Moses from this place where He would put His Name, according to His promise in Ex. 25:22 to make known His will through him to the people. The first of these revelations related to the sacrifices, in which the Israelites were to draw near (korban) to God, that they might become partakers of His grace.

The patriarchs, when sojourning in Canaan, had already worshipped the God who revealed Himself to them, with both **burnt offerings and slain offerings** (we saw this above in the form of “burnt offerings”). Whether their descendants, the children of Israel, had offered sacrifices to the God of their Fathers during their stay in Egypt, we cannot tell as there is no Biblical allusion whatever to the subject in the short account of these 430 years. Yet we know from archeology that such was the case. What is certain is that they had not forgotten to regard the sacrifices as a leading part of the worship of God, and were ready to follow Moses into the desert, to serve the God of their Fathers there by a solemn act of sacrificial worship (Ex. 5:1-3; 4:31; 8:4); and also, that after the exodus from Egypt, not only did **Jethro offer burnt offerings and slain offerings** to God in the camp of the Israelites, and prepare a sacrificial meal in which the elders of Israel took part along with Moses and Aaron (Ex. 18:12), but **young men offered burnt offerings and slain offerings** by the command of Moses at the conclusion of the covenant (Ex. 24:5). Consequently sacrificial laws of these chapters presuppose the presentation of **burnt offerings, meat-offerings, and slain offerings** as a custom well known to the people and a necessity demanded by their religious feelings. They were not introduced among the Israelites for the first time by Moses by what he learned at Sinai, because animal sacrifices date from the earliest period of mankind.

Answer for yourself: Are you curious why we have not found “sin offering” yet and we are up to Moses in our time-line?

The subject of sacrificial laws in the book of Leviticus was not to enforce sacrificial worship upon the Israelites, nor to apply some sort of a theory concerning the Hebrew sacrifices, but simply to organize and expand the already existing sacrificial worship of the Israelites into an institution in harmony with the covenant between the Lord and His people, and adapt and promote the end for which it was established... communion and fellowship with God. You need to fully understand what was just said. Read it again please.

But although sacrifice in general reaches up to the earliest times of man's history, and is met with in every nation, it was **NOT** enjoined upon the human race by any positive commandment of God, but sprang out of a religious necessity for fellowship with God. These sacrifices assumed very different forms in different tribes and nations, in consequence of their estrangement from God, and their growing loss of all true knowledge of Him.

Their ideas of the Divine Being were regulated by the nature, object, and significance of the sacrifices they offered, and they were quite as subservient to the worship of idols as to that of the one true God. To discover the fundamental idea, which was common to all the sacrifices, we must remember, that the first sacrifices were presented after the fall.

Also interesting by its absence is any mention of SIN OFFERINGS, PRIESTHOOD, EXPIATION or FORGIVENESS in the PRE-Mosaic sacrifices of the Old Testament....in other words NOT before the Golden Calf incident....more on that soon.

This is very important and you need to let this fact sink deeply into your Christian theology!

There are very important reasons for the omission of “sin offerings” as you will soon discover. Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #3

FORGIVENESS WAS NOT THE THEME OF SACRIFICES BEFORE MOSES AND THE GOLDEN CALF - BUT REPRESENTING FELLOWSHIP OF ONE'S SOUL WITH GOD

Before the fall man lived in blessed unity with God. This unity was destroyed by sin, and the fellowship between God and man was disturbed, thought not entirely abolished. In the punishment which God inflicted upon the sinners, He did not withdraw His mercy from men; and before driving them out of paradise, He gave them clothes to cover the nakedness of their shame, by which they had first of all become conscious of their sin. Even after the expulsion He still manifest Himself to them, so that they were able once more to draw near to Him and enter into fellowship with Him. This fellowship (NOT forgiveness) they sought through the medium of sacrifices, in which they gave a visible expression not only to their gratitude towards God for His blessing and His grace, but also to their supplication for the further continuance of His divine favor. It was in this sense that both Cain and Abel offered sacrifices [burnt offerings and NOT sin offerings...remember?], thought not with the same motives or in the same state of heart toward God. In this sense of fellowship and not forgiveness Noah also offered sacrifice [burnt offerings and NOT sin offerings...remember?]. After Noah's deliverance from the flood; something changed in the offering of sacrifices. Whereas the sons of Adam offered their sacrifices to God from the fruit of their labor, in the tilling of the ground and the keeping of sheep, Noah presented his burnt offering from the clean cattle and birds that had been shut up with him in the ark (those animals would from that time forward be assigned to man as food...Gen. 9:3). Noah was probably led to make this selection by the command of God to take with him into the ark not one or more pairs, but 7 of every kind of clean beasts. Noah may have discerned in this an indication of the divine will, that the 7th animal of every description of clean beast and bird should be offered in sacrifice to the Lord, for His gracious protection from destruction by the flood. Also notice the distinction of "clean and unclean" foods long before the Sinai experience. Moses, in Leviticus revelation, also received a still further intimation as to the meaning of the animal sacrifices. We see this in the prohibition which God appended to the permission to make use of animals as well as green herbs for food: "flesh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, shall ye not eat" (Gen. 9:4-5). This prohibition is because the flesh still contained the blood as the animal's soul (the soul lives in the blood of the animal). In this there was already an intimation, that in the bleeding sacrifice the soul/life of the animal was given up to God with the blood; and therefore; that by virtue of its blood as the vehicle of the soul, animal sacrifice was the most fitting means of representing the surrender of the human soul to God. THIS IS VERY IMPORTANT! You will quickly come to see that the "blood" accomplished nothing; rather it was a picture of the soul of the person who brought the animal to the altar.

THE SOUL OF THE ANIMAL AS FOUND IN IT'S BLOOD REPRESENTED, WHEN PRESENTED ON THE ALTAR, THE SURRENDER OF THE HUMAN SOUL TO GOD

It is not the "blood" but the "soul" in the blood which demonstrates surrender to God and it is later to be understood as seen as placed on the altar where we see the "soul of the offerer of sacrifices" on the altar in lieu of the animal which is but a substitute for the person bringing the animal for sacrifice. The animal was literally the extension of the person bringing the sacrifice. God would not have a human sacrifice his life and blood and place it upon the altar as a demonstration of "communion" and "fellowship" with God; instead the animal was the extension of the person's life. The person bringing the animal had fed, groomed, and cared for the animal usually. It was part of his life and his life and energy had been invested into the care of the animal. So when the "soul" of the animal was taken and offered upon the altar in the release and placing of the animal's blood on the altar, then the person by proxy was represented on the altar in communion with God as well. Understand the animal was innocent having never sinned. This was supposed to be a picture of the spiritual position of the person bringing the sacrifice. The person bringing the sacrifice was ALREADY to have repented of his sin, confessed his sin, prayed, and made restitution to his fellowman if needed BEFORE he ever brought the animal to the altar. Then when he had done these spiritual necessities PRIOR to bringing the animal to the altar, then the person's soul was AT-THAT-MOMENT (atonement) right with God. He was forgiven and his repentance, confession, prayer, and restitution had accomplished for him atonement PRIOR to the animal being offered. "At that moment" his soul was again in right standing and relationship with God. In order to make such a declaration to the world and his fellowman, as well as to God, then he would take an animal and it would be slain and its blood placed on the altar. In so doing, the animal was a CORRECT PICTURE of the spiritual state of the person {if he had previously before bringing the animal repented, confessed, prayed, made restitution if possible, given alms, etc.} making the sacrifice for the animal's soul (in the animal's blood) was on the altar in communion with God and was NOW a true picture of the sacrificer's soul in communion with God if had repented as stated above before he came to the altar!

Besides this, if anyone wanted to eat meat, the animal's soul had to be given back to God before the flesh could be consumed. So you see in the sacrificial system there were two dynamics at work: atonement and the conditions necessary to eat meat which also contained the Divine image which had to be given by to God.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice we have not mentioned "sin offerings" yet?

HOW IS JESUS RELATED TO ALL THIS?

What I just described in the sacrificial system is an aspect of the death of Yeshua that most likely you have never even considered. This truth may possibly have been only dimly surmised by Noah and his sons; but it must have been clearly revealed to the patriarch Abraham when God demanded the sacrifice of his only son, with whom his whole heart was bound up, as a proof of his obedience of faith, and after he had attested his faith in his readiness to offer this sacrifice, supplied him with a ram to offer as a burnt-offering [burnt offerings and NOT sin offerings...remember?], instead of his own (Gen. 22). In this the truth was practically revealed to him, that the *true God did not require human sacrifice from His worshipers, but the surrender of heart/soul and the denial of the natural life, even thought it should amount to a submission to death itself.* This act of surrender was to be perfected in the animal's sacrifice; and that it was only when presented with these motives that sacrifice would be pleasing to God. Yeshua was willing to die if need be for the kingdom to come. The problem was that Israel did not merit the kingdom; even during the 40 years following his death. Simply said: no kingdom, no King!

That means prophecies not fulfilled. So we wait!

PURPOSE OF OFFERINGS

The word "korban" is commonly translated either "sacrifice" or "offering", but the truth is that the English language does not possess a word that accurately expresses the concept contained in the word. The word "sacrifice" implies that the person bringing it is required to deprive himself of something in order to satisfy someone else's need, but God finds no satisfaction in inflicting pain or deprivation upon His children. The word "offering" is closer to the mark but it too fails to convey the true meaning of a "korban". "Offering" implies that the Recipient of the gift must be appeased, that He requires a tribute that will somehow appease His wrath or make Him receptive to the entreaties of a supplicant, or that He has a need that can only be satisfied by someone other than Himself. As if God required our gifts! "If you have acted righteously, what will you have given Him! (Job 35:7); God does not become enriched by man's accomplishments.

The Hebrew word itself provides the answer. The root of the meaning is "to come near." Again the idea carries the concept of fellowship. The person bringing an offering does so in order to come closer to God, to elevate his level of spirituality thereby approaching God in the Spirit.

Now remember the person brought the animal as a picture of himself in that through his repentance, confession, prayer, and restitution he was "coming near" to God and the sacrifice of the animal and the placing of the animal's soul on the altar was a demonstration that he, the person bringing the sacrifice, had ALREADY "drawn near to God" and the soul of the animals was a true picture of himself NOW since repenting previously before coming to the altar. The offering was a picture of that spiritual fact to all the world as well as for God to see!

When Adam was deposited in the Garden of Eden, his first responsibility was to work it and guard it (Gen. 2:15). That means that Adam was commanded to plant, work, cultivate; everything that was necessary to keep the Garden as a Paradise. Before Adam's sin, man had no need to be a peasant; everything grew for him at God's command, with no need for him to exert himself in any way. It was only after his sin that he was expelled from Eden and required to earn his bread through the sweat of his brow.

How then was he to *work and guard* Eden? Through the study of Torah and the performance of positive and negative commandments. His livelihood would come in return for his obedience to God's will. God will always respond to man's righteousness by blessing his material efforts.

Adam's mission was to make himself an offering in his lifetime, by dedicating himself unreservedly to God. On God's Throne of Glory, there is an image of a man (Ez. 1:10). Every human being has his own image above, his ideal spiritual self, which represents his goal and his potential. Man's soul is placed in an earthly body so that he can surmount the challenges of material life and raise himself up to his personal, heavenly self; to unite his earthly self with his higher self. Just as everyone has a body and a soul, and his mission is to triumph in the eternal struggle of body versus soul, so, too, many must struggle to live up to the summons of his higher self.

Man is religious yet he sins! How can he defy the Creator he believe in? He is kind and generous, yet he is sometimes mean and stingy. He is moral, but has lapses in conduct. Whatever man is, he is often inconsistent, and if he is honest with himself, he knows that he is far from living up to his inner image. He wants his body to come closer to his soul; on a yet higher level, he should also want his soul to live up to its counterpart on high.

Similarly, there is a Temple in heaven that corresponds to the Temple on earth. The masters of Kabbalah teach that the good deeds of the people of God accumulate to build a spiritual replica of that heavenly Temple, and when there are enough such good deeds, the heavenly Temple will come down to the Temple Mount, signaling the end of the exile and the beginning of the perfect world foretold by the prophets. This is similar to the striving of the individual soul. There is a higher ideal we must see to capture in our mundane lives. Possibly it is best expressed by the Psalmist: "the heavens are the Lord's, but the earth He has given to mankind (Psm.

115:16). The heavens are already heavenly; God does not need man to improve upon them. But He has given us the earth that we might **make it heavenly**, as well. **God gave mankind the Torah as instruction to bring heaven to earth through obedience of God's will as expressed in His living Word.** This is best expressed through acts of Loving Kindness (Gemilut Hasadim) and Repairing of the World (Tikkun Olam). Adam was the offering, and for him to devote anything less than his maximum to God would have been to steal his Divinely conferred potential and misappropriate it for himself. The sin of eating from the Tree of Knowledge was such a misappropriation because he would be flouting the will of God. **The truest offering is when the owner brings "himself" to God, making himself and his desires subservient to the teachings and guidelines of the Torah.** The symbolism of the offerings is based on this concept; that the animal is secondary; that is but an indication of what its owner feels and toward what he strives.

REASONS FOR THE OFFERINGS

The function and purpose of the offerings are not concepts that man can grasp rationally. Especially in modern times when anything not measurable, observable, or replicable is questioned and denied, the idea of offerings is not an easy one to understand. It is necessary, therefore, to understand that they and their efficacy are manifestations of God's plan and wisdom. They are reality, even though we have never seen them and have no personal experience through which to know their potency.

We cannot understand why the slaughter of a sanctified animal, the placing of its blood and the burning of its flesh on the Altar; why these acts should bring God's Presence down to earth (accomplishes fellowship). Had the Jewish people been asked about the possibility of this happening before they had seen it, perhaps even they would have been skeptical. **But they saw it happen!** They saw the cloud of God's glory descend upon the Tent of Meeting. They saw a heavenly fire descend to their Altar and remain there for hundreds of years. They saw a Divine glow on Moses' face. To them, these were demonstrable, visible, tangible facts.

This is incomprehensible to our rational, scientific minds. But so was the splitting of the atom to rational minds a hundred years ago.

Various reasons for the offerings are given by classic commentators. The reason for the offerings is so profound that it is beyond human comprehension and the best efforts of the greatest of Jewish thinkers can yield only a drop in the ocean of God's intent.

OFFERINGS AS A SUBSTITUTE FOR MAN...BUT WE ALREADY SAID THAT

The offerings were seen to elevate three parts of every human deed: **thought, speech, and action.** When a person sins and then brings an offering, all three of those elements are used to take the sinful use to which he had previously put them, and transform it into the instrument of doing God's will. The person bringing the offering performs the commandment of **leaning, by placing his hands on its head and leaning on it, thereby dedicating his strength and activity to God. He purifies his thought and intentions, by confessing his sin,** pronouncing the spiritual goal that he hopes to attain, or uttering praises to God. As a further way of **purging his sinful thoughts, the innards of the animal;** representing the human organs that are the seat of desire and through, are **burned on God's Altar.** In the case of an elevation-offering, which is completely burned, the animal's feet symbolize the hands and feet with which man ran and acted to defy his Creator. **The animal's blood (containing its soul), representing man's soul, was placed on the Altar (notice it is the soul that is placed upon the Altar; just not the blood).**

Let's look at Leviticus 17:11 in context in order to make sure we understand the "central" idea of the passage.

"And whatever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who sojourn among you, who

consumes any blood, I will set My face against that person who consumes blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the **life** [SUBJECT OF THE SENTENCE] of the flesh is in the blood [DIRECT OBJECT OF THE SENTENCE], and I have **given it** [THE LIFE] to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is **the blood** [LIFE IN THE BLOOD REMEMBER?] that makes an atonement for the soul. Therefore, I say to the children of Israel, 'No one among you shall consume blood, nor shall any stranger who sojourns among you consume blood.'

Answer for yourself: Did you know that “blood” was not the subject of the sentence? Did you notice what was? Did you understand that it was the “life” that was placed on the altar for atonement and not the blood?

In other words it is not the blood that atones, but the “soul” [LIFE] that atones..a life that repents, prays, confesses sin, makes restitution, gives alms, etc....!!!

Answer for yourself: Are you aware that as a Christian you whole understanding of the sacrificial system in the Bible is wrong because you have focused on “blood” for atonement instead of the “life” in the blood which is the real atoning agent?

BUT ISAIAH 53 SAYS...OR DOES IT?

Well not it does not say what you think it says. Why? You are reading most likely from your Christian Bible which is a very poor translation, or should I say, a very good mistranslation of Isaiah 53. This is why I spend so much time on the text. The Bible Jesus used and read did not read anything like our Christian Old Testament in hundreds of places. Isaiah is a good instance. Below is what the Palestinian Jewish Scriptures, called the Tanakh, reads for verse 10 of Isaiah 53:

Isa. 53:10 states “ HaShem desired to oppress him and He afflicted him; **if his soul would acknowledge guilt...**”

WOW!

That sure is different from what your Christian Bible says:

Isa 53:10...IN THE KJV CHRISTIAN BIBLE...WHY IS IT DIFFERENT FROM THE HEBREW?

10 Yet it pleased the LORD to bruise him; he hath put him to grief: when thou shalt make his **soul an offering for sin**, he shall see his seed, he shall prolong his days, and the pleasure of the LORD shall prosper in his hand. (KJV)

Simply said, this Christian translation has been “Jesusized” by having the concept of guilt removed, for in Christian “theology” Jesus can have no guilt and many try to make him the subject of the passage when the real uncorrupted Hebrew Scripture define the suffering servant as the corporate nation of Israel and not one individual

Back to the subject at hand.

In one of the greatest passages in the Bible, we are told by Isaiah the prophet that if the “soul” of the “suffering servant” would acknowledge guilt...confess sin, pray, repent...

Answer for yourself: What do you do when you acknowledge guilt?

You confess and then repent. This is the subject of the verse. You literally turn around your “life”. Your life changes direction; from sin to righteousness. You no longer continue your sinister ways. Now you can see how such a life, after repentance and confession of sin, was understood, even as the Christian Bibles say: “soul/life an offering for sin”! One’s life, when turned to God and away from sin, was the atonement that Leviticus 17 speaks about.

Answer for yourself: Could we have missed this understanding when looking at the death of Jesus or, as Isaiah said, the martyrdoms of millions of Israelites (remember Jesus is paradigm of all Jews)?

While this procedure (placing the animal’s soul on the alter in substitute for yours) is being accomplished with one’s offering, the sacrificer meditates upon his sin, for the offering service teaches him graphically that he has sinned against God with body and soul. He contemplates that justice would have dictated that *his* human body be burned on the altar as a penalty for sin and his soul required by God in lieu of the animal’s blood be placed upon it. It is only God’s graciousness that permits the animal to become his substitute. Then, parts of the offering are given to the Kohanim (priests/teachers), so that those who dedicate their lives to study and teach the Torah are sustained through him and so that they will pray for him. It is an act of supreme graciousness that God is prepared to accept an offering from us instead of punishing us directly for our misdeeds. This is why the offerings are described throughout Leviticus as a satisfying aroma to God, because God is pleased when His children repent and seek to change their lives for the better.

When one brings an offering with such noble thoughts he has truly made himself an offering. The Sages have said of one who brings a humble meal-offering, it is as if he had offered his own life upon the altar. He thereby raised his mundane desires and makes them worthy of being placed on the heavenly altar.

More to follow. Shalom.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #4

WHAT PICTURES CAN WE NOW SEE MORE CLEARLY AS CONTAINED IN THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM OF ISRAEL?

Let us not forget what we just have learned. It was the soul of the animal as found in it's blood, which when presented in a sacrifice AFTER the prior repentance, confession, and prayer of the sinner, was understood by God as the surrender of that person's soul toward Him. This is what it is all about, and will always be about.

A SHORT REVIEW

It is not the "blood" but the "soul" in the blood which demonstrates surrender to God and it is later to be understood as seen as placed on the altar where we see the "soul of the offerer of sacrifices" on the altar in lieu of the animal which is but a substitute for the person bringing the animal for sacrifice. The animal was literally the extension of the person bringing the sacrifice. God would not have a human sacrifice his life and blood and place it upon the altar as a demonstration of "communion" and "fellowship" with God; instead the animal was the extension of the person's life. The person bringing the animal had fed, groomed, and cared for the animal usually. It was part of his life and his life and energy had been invested into the care of the animal. So when the "soul" of the animal was taken and offered upon the altar in the release and placing of the animal's blood on the altar, then the person by proxy was represented on the altar in communion with God as well. Understand the animal was innocent having never sinned. This was supposed to be a picture of the spiritual position of the person bringing the sacrifice. The person bringing the sacrifice was ALREADY to have repented of his sin, confessed his sin, prayed, and made restitution to his fellowman if needed BEFORE he ever brought the animal to the altar. Then when he had done these spiritual necessities PRIOR to bringing the animal to the altar, then the person's soul was AT-THAT-MOMENT (atonement) right with God. He was forgiven and his repentance, confession, prayer, and restitution had accomplished for him atonement PRIOR to the animal being offered. "At that moment" his soul was again in right standing and relationship with God. In order to make such a declaration to the world and his fellowman, as well as to God, then he would take an animal and it would be slain and its blood placed on the altar. In so doing, the animal was a CORRECT PICTURE of the spiritual state of the person making the sacrifice for the animal's soul (in his blood) was on the altar in communion with God and was NOW a true picture of the sacrificer's soul in communion with God. Besides this, if anyone wanted to eat meat, the animal's soul had to be given back to God before the flesh could be consumed. So you see in the sacrificial system there were two dynamics at work: atonement and the conditions necessary to eat meat which also contained the Divine image which had to be given by to God.

WHAT DID BOTH GOD AND THE SACRIFICER KNOW THEN THAT

WE DON'T TODAY?

When, when making sacrifice properly, knew that he had attained something special with God. Christian teaching today is completely devoid of this knowledge and I thank I over the years in my studies He allowed me to find and recover this most needed part of instruction. This knowledge, when properly understood, will go a long way in helping the Christian separate error from truth as he hears taught in his churches.

UNION WITH GOD AND FELLOWSHIP WITH GOD RESULTED

Whenever the Torah commands that offerings be brought, these commandments use only God's Four-letter Name (yod-hey-vah-hey); the "Tetragrammaton" (I AM). If other names were used, some might err, thinking that there are many Gods or forces, one demanding this offering and another demanding some other offering. Since the Name *Elokim* represents God as the One Who controls nature, that Name might be taken to imply that there is an angel or a power who has dominion over a particular land or aspect of existence, and that that power requires the offering. The Four-Letter Name is formed of the letters that spell, *was, is and will be*, meaning that God is eternal. This is not God as He appears in a particular manifestation (Judge, Provider, Life-giver) but God as He *is*.

This is His Name as the God of Mercy. No one should think that God requires offerings to feed or appease Him. The Eternal One has no needs that man can satisfy for everything is His and nothing is beyond His power!

Answer for yourself: What then is the purpose of the offerings?

You should have seen by now that these offerings provided man an opportunity to unite himself to God to whatever extent it is possible for mortal man to do so through repentance, confession, and restitution.

Similarly, there is a humanly created fire below on the altar and there is the Heavenly fire from above, which God has placed upon Israel's altar. Both of these flames are fed by the offerings of the Jewish people, symbolizing the union of man's spiritual aspirations with God's goals for him. Thus the offerings provide Israel a means for spiritual elevation [drawing closer to God].

THE SACRIFICER HAD AN ACCURATE UNDERSTANDING OF HIMSELF BEFORE GOD....ACKNOWLEDGING "ONE'S OWN" NOTHINGNESS

All creatures emanate from God and have no independent existence on their own. Man has freedom of choice and his intellect puts great achievements within his reach, but all of this is possible only because God gives him the power to do so. Man could not function or even exist without God. The goal of creation is for man to acknowledge this basic fact; to recognize and proclaim that everything exists because of God and nothing can survive without Him. There are many ways for God's glory to be revealed and recognized. The highest recognition of all is for man to know The Oneness of God, meaning that there is nothing aside from Him. He achieves his ultimate greatness when he recognizes that *there is none beside Him* (Deut. 4:35). An offering is a demonstration of this concept. It says that its owner is surrendering his possessions to their Source (God). Theoretically, one might expect him to be ready to give even his very life in acknowledgment of God's sovereignty, but that is not His will. God wants man to live, to grow, to thrive, to serve; and God ordains the offerings as man's way to recognize His Oneness. Thus, by offering his possessions [as seen in the animal presented to God in sacrifice], one symbolizes that he has no existence but for God's will.

UNITING BODY AND SOUL...BEING ONE WITH GOD

The efficacy of offerings in obtaining God's favor is comparable to the way food makes it possible for the soul to maintain its attachment to the body. Material food cannot provide nourishment to the soul, which is not a physical entity. It is this nourishment of the body that enables it to remain healthy enough to play host to the

soul. Likewise, the "food of the Altar's fire" somehow effects the process that enables the Shechinah to remain among Israel.

The food of the soul is not measured in calories, vitamins, and minerals. Only intellectual and spiritual pursuits can nourish the soul. Torah study, prayer, even meals in celebration of such events as Sabbath and Festivals all have a sacred content that is capable of nourishing the soul. Only in this sense do the offerings constitute food for God. Man's dedication to Him and His commandments provides the nourishment that enables the Shechinah to attach itself to human beings and their handiwork. We think of food in terms of nutritive value, but that is not what sustains life. Man does not live merely because of the bread (material component). He lives through the bread's spiritual component; *what emanates from the mouth of God*. This is what holds together body and soul and what holds together Godliness and Israel through the agency of the offerings.

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER

Having now come to the understanding that it was a life lived above sin that was so pleasing to God that He accepted such a life as an offering and atonement for one's sin, it should behoove you to rethink what you believe about atonement as a Christian. If you were to do some comparative religious study you will see the preponderance of evidence of how pagan concepts of salvation are woven into Pauline theology. I have shown you the Biblical teachings of atonement and have not mentioned Paul's theology once. The reason I have not is that nowhere in the Jewish Masoretic Palestinian text are such Pauline concepts of atonement found. Only when you read the fraudulent and mistranslated Greek Scriptures, which the Rabbis did not translate, do you begin to find such ideas surfacing in the text (<http://geocities.com/faithofyeshua>). But never fail to understand that such concepts cannot be found in the Jewish Scriptures from which the Greek translation emanated. Somebody "fixed" the Greek translation to read differently. And sadly for you, these altered and paganized Greek mistranslation became the foundation for your Christian Old Testament. To make matters worse, your New Testament quotes from the fraudulent Old Testament (<http://www.faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>). Over and over as you read your Christian Bible you only reinforce and rehearse error! You need to know that. But that happened over 2000 years ago and who knows? Well I do, and others do who have studied enough to see it! The Jews have always known. It is the secularized Jews of today who don't. It is time someone told you! The righteous Jews know this and have known this since 200 BC when the Greek translation was understood by them to be a corruption of the Jewish Scriptures. History records 3 attempts of the Jews to correct such a forged Greek translation but sadly their efforts were not to overtake the popularity of the already translated LXX (Septuagint).

Understand an animal's soul represented the soul of one making the sacrifice, and we, as non-Jews, today are beneficiaries of having the Jew's soul (Jesus) given in place of ours along with their prayers for our sin. Jesus is the archetype for all of Israel. He is the greatest of all the "Suffering Servants" of the God of Israel. But in this lesson we must no longer overlook the importance of a life lived above sin which procures one's redemption and not the inert blood of the animal or of Jesus. Lives lived honoring God through faith and obedience atones. Your Covenant requires it! Such is the message of Bet Emet as we are called to live like Jesus and not just "believe in Jesus." It has been my experience as a Pastor over the years to encounter multitudes of Christians who trust in Christ's blood instead of understanding the importance of his life, symbolized by his soul in his blood, as lived in obedience to God as a form of atonement, or even their own lives, as lived pleasing to God for their OWN atonement. We must walk out our salvation with fear and trembling. We are co-laborers with God in our own salvation through faith and repentance. Such a mistaken understanding of our redemption since not being taught the truth from a Hebraic perspective has caused multitudes of Christians to trust in the acclaimed miraculous powers of the blood of Jesus instead of focusing of the miraculousness of a life lived above sin. Such a false sense of security in "blood" instead of "lives lived holy before God and man" unconsciously causes the believer to not regard sin with revulsion as he should. We tend to view sin as less harmful than it is, and compromise with sin lies at the door.

The bottom line for all Christians to understand is that we have heard way too much preached about

Jesus and far too little studied from the texts of the Jewish Bible which tell us exactly and accurately who he is as well as his original mission. If we had studied the original sources available to us, we would not be so mixed up theologically in Christianity today which boasts over 2000 different denominations all maintaining they have the truth about Jesus while at the same time being the most violent and crime ridden nation in the world.

SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH THE MESSAGE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...LOOK AT THE FRUIT OF THIS MESSAGE IN OUR COUNTRY WITH A CHURCH ON EVERY CORNER AND TELEVISIONS FILLED WITH THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE OF GRACE WITHOUT ACCOUNTABILITY FOR ONE'S OWN SIN! JUST LOOK OUT YOUR DOOR AND ASK IF THAT IS THE BEST THE HOLY SPIRIT CAN DO????????

I don't plan to get into why the Christian message at this time but suffice to say that the Christian message is corrupted due to it's pagan content over Jewish content as we see for example in the alteration of Jewish texts in the real Hebrew Isaiah for example but let it suffice to say as shown beyond question on many of our other sites that we are in this sad state today because instead of being a true follower of Jesus and his Jewish faith we are camped at the feet of pagan Rome and Paul's antinomianism (anti-Law). May God forgive our laziness of letting others tell us what to believe instead of us studying to show ourselves approved unto God. I just showed you part of the problem. Implicitly we are led to not revere the Laws and Commandments of God because of the solar teaching that "Jesus died for me" and my get out of jail card saves me. This comes straight out of sun worship as you have seen on this site and others. As a Pastor I saw such falsehoods lived out in the lives of the congregation year after year. When there is no Law, no Commandments, no requirements, no accountability, then there is no righteous fruit and we have our newspapers filled with horror story after horror story. And sadly few can count on their lives being a sufficient atonement for their sin because they have been taught a pagan sun-godman story which allows his followers to get away with anything. Emotionalism is a sorry substitute for knowledge.

Answer for yourself: For after all if saved by the blood of Jesus, what need do I have to live like Jesus and not disobey the commandments of God? Isn't Jesus my "grace card"?

Answer for yourself: If saved by the blood of another, what does a little sin mean...what can it hurt?

Answer for yourself: See the tragic thinking involved in focusing upon the blood of Jesus instead of the life of Jesus lived above sin? Now look out your window to the world and see what the fruit of 1700 years of erroneous teaching has grown!

THINK!

Shalom.



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #5

LOOKING AT PAUL'S THEOLOGY....WHAT IS TRUTH?

We must not forget what we just learned. As the reader you must understand that what you learned is the "theology" of sacrifice and any other "sacrifice" must fit this mode of understanding. This means when viewing the death of Yeshua one must be equipped with this understanding before trying to evaluate the meanings that might be attached to his death. Along with this one must equally be equipped with sufficient information concerning comparative religions and the death of their "gods". Only if one comes to the "Jesus materials" possessing this information can he be guaranteed to be able to discern the true meaning of his death or at least see if concepts from "pagan mystery religions" have been attached to his death. **This is especially important when reading Paul's writings.** With what we have just learned as a background let us return to Paul's statement that "Christ died for our sins" which was the fundamental fact of the early Gentile Christian message, the corner-stone of early Gentile Christianity (but not Jewish Christianity or Messianism). But as soon as this simple fact is stated a number of vital questions are bound to arise. In order that we may have an intelligent and correct understanding of this important doctrine it is necessary that we know precisely what occurred and did not occur when Jesus died on the cross. We cannot rest content with teaching that leaves the central doctrine of the Christian faith shrouded in mystery and uncertainty. This does not mean that all mystery can be removed. But the Scriptures do supply the interpretation of the death of Christ that the inquiring mind legitimately asks for, and the salient factors concerning it should be known by all Christian people. Believing that the Hebrew Scriptures (the Palestinian Masoretic Text and not the corrupted LXX from which your Christian Old Testament originates) is God's word to man, and that the statements of Scripture regarding the death of Jesus in the Greek New Testament are often **mistranslated on purpose** (<http://geocities.com/faithofyeshua>), then if you, ordinary Christian men and women, are to even find the truth concerning the death of Jesus, then we must deal with some rather difficult information at times. It is not my wish to destroy anyone's faith, only to expose the changes made to the text as well as the lies that have been passed down about the death of Jesus which his original follower never "believed". We hold it to be our task and privilege under the promised guidance of the Holy Spirit to "search the Scriptures", the Jewish Scriptures that Yeshua himself accepted, until we reach that understanding which satisfies the mind and heart and conscience, and leads to certainty and finality.

According to the New Testament, especially the writings of Paul, we are told, for instance, in broad terms that we are members of a fallen race, that God has given His only-begotten Son for our atonement, and that salvation is through Him (Messiah) and not through any works which we ourselves are able to do.

Answer for yourself: How correct is this statement when compared with the teachings of the Hebrew Scriptures concerning atonement and forgiveness?

Let us not forget what we just learned in the prior articles.

Certainly anyone who accepts these facts and acts upon them will be “saved” because the fruit of the Christian message leads to Godliness. Yet, accepting these facts and acting upon them would appear to represent only a minimum of faith, and God has made it possible for us greatly to enrich and expand our knowledge of the way of salvation if we will but give careful attention to His word. But the problem is great; you first have to know if you, the Christian, even has His Word, or if your Old Testament is corrupted in special places. For example, the Isaiah translations in the Old Testament of your Christian Bible read completely different in many “messianic” passages as opposed to the Jewish Tanakh. You should ask yourself “why” your Christian Old Testament reads so much different from the Jewish Scriptures from which it was supposedly taken! Most likely you never knew this. It is time to awaken to such sad facts, for it is these alterations which have led to false beliefs concerning Yeshua, his life, and his death.

ANOTHER LOOK AT LEVITICUS 17:11 ...POSSIBLY THE MOST IMPORTANT THING YOU CAN EVER LEARN

Christians generally insist that the absolute need for a vicarious blood sacrifice is rooted in the Torah (first five books of the Old Testament), and cite as proof Leviticus 17:11 "For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make an atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul." The sad fact of the matter is that most Christians and Pastors don't understand the verse at all.

As a Christian, you have probably heard many sermons on the topic of atonement, and have undoubtedly read many studies which support the contention that there is “no atonement without blood.” But the truth of the matter is that neither the Book of Hebrews [it says “**almost all things**”..**not “all things**”] or the Old Testament says that. Of course you are also aware that this is a teaching which is not shared by traditional Jews and for a very good reason which has escaped the Gentile Christian church because of their mistranslation, alteration, and therefore misinterpretation of the passages in their Bibles as well as because of superficial reading of the whole Bible.

Answer for yourself: Have you ever wondered how the Jewish people could reject what to you seems so clear? Why would anyone reject a “free” salvation? It does not make sense to the rational mind.

You might remember that in junior high school, we were often given an assignment to write the title for a story; what is the central idea of a passage. Let's look at Leviticus 17:11 in context in order to make sure we understand the “central” idea of the passage.

"And whatever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who sojourn among you, who consumes any blood, I will set My face against that person who consumes blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul. Therefore, I say to the children of Israel, 'No one among you shall consume blood, nor shall any stranger who sojourns among you consume blood.'"

What should immediately be apparent is that the topic of this passage is **NOT how to secure atonement from sins**, but the prohibition against consuming blood. We are told parenthetically that the reason for this prohibition is that the **blood contains the vitality (soul) of the animal** (Genesis 9:4, Deuteronomy 12:23) and consequently, when we bring an animal sacrifice, its soul (life) which is in its blood serves as the atoning agent,

and not another part of its body [the blood]. The writer of Leviticus informs us that it is the soul, one's life, which is in the blood [blood is the object of the preposition "in"] which was offered to God daily and even in death which was pleasing to God and which God accepted as an "atonement" and as an "offering for sin". Notice that it is not the "blood" which was accepted for an offering for sin, but rather the "life/soul" which was "in" the blood. "Blood" is not the subject of the sentence. This might be a shock to you but "life" is the subject of the sentence. Or better said, it is the "life" which is the subject of the sentence. That means **it is not the "death" or "the blood" which accomplished anything, but rather the life of one which provided atonement. Such a life is one lived in repentance, confession, prayer, and restitution as shown earlier in these articles and as attested by the Jewish Bible.** Even your Christian Old Testament will teach you the same things if you are aware of it. It just so happens that the "life of the one bringing the sacrifice" is "pictured" in the life of the animal as the animal's blood is placed on the altar.

The Hebrew word for "life" which is in the blood is the word for "soul". Such a life, if it was to be accepted as an atonement, was one which was lived completely obediently to God's Commandments [by which he never sinned]. Such a life that turned from sin was so pleasing to God that He accepted such a life as an offering for one's own sin. Such a life was lived in a constant intent to live the commandments of God and when one fell short through sin one was preoccupied to **repent and then recapture one's right standing with God. After repentance, "at that moment", one was restored into right standing and relationship with God and the placing of the blood of the animal was representative of the sacrificer's soul before God since he had ALREADY repented. The animal was a picture of him at that time. The soul of the animal was a picture of the sacrificer's soul, but only if he had repented PRIOR to bringing the sacrifice. Now you can understand why God at times tells us that He is wearied by the sacrifices of the people. They were just killing the animals and there was no repentance in their hearts!**

Isa 1:10-17

- 10 Hear the word of the LORD, ye rulers of Sodom; give ear unto the law of our God, ye people of Gomorrah.
- 11 To what purpose is the multitude of your sacrifices unto me? saith the LORD: I am full of the burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed beasts; and I delight not in the blood of bullocks, or of lambs, or of he goats.
- 12 When ye come to appear before me, who hath required this at your hand, to tread my courts?
- 13 Bring no more vain oblations; incense is an abomination unto me; the new moons and sabbaths, the calling of assemblies, I cannot away with; it is iniquity, even the solemn meeting.
- 14 Your new moons and your appointed feasts my soul hateth: they are a trouble unto me; I am weary to bear them.
- 15 And when ye spread forth your hands, I will hide mine eyes from you: yea, when ye make many prayers, I will not hear: your hands are full of blood.

Notice that God is tired of ritual without repentance.

Notice what God says next and the remedy to this sad state of spiritual affairs He finds in His people. Notice what God tells them what they must do!

- 16 Wash you, make you clean; put away the evil of your doings from before mine eyes; cease to do evil;
- 17 Learn to do well; seek judgment, relieve the oppressed, judge the fatherless, plead for the widow.

There you have it. Through repentance, confession, and a return to obedience to the Laws and Commandments of God the people could again be

received by Him. Nowhere did God say He did not want the people to continue bringing the sacrifices if their hearts were contrite and repentant. Only then, as you have learned, was their hearts to be represented by the animal's blood and soul on the altar. Anything else was a lie. Such was a waste of life; not only theirs but the animal's as well.

LET US LOOK A LITTLE MORE CLOSELY

The Hebrew word for “soul” is as follows as seen in Strong’s Concordance:

5315 nephesh (neh'-fesh);

from 5314; properly, a breathing creature, i.e. animal of (abstractly) vitality; used very widely in a literal, accommodated or figurative sense (bodily or mental):

KJV-- any, appetite, beast, body, breath, creature, X dead (-ly), desire, X [dis-] contented, X fish, ghost, + greedy, he, heart (-y), (hath, X jeopardy of) life (X in jeopardy), lust, man, me, mind, mortally, one, own, person, pleasure, (her-, him-, my-, thyself-), them (your)- selves, + slay, soul, + tablet, they, thing, (X she) will, X would have it.

The Hebrew word for “soul” is as follows as seen in Brown-Drivers-Briggs Hebrew Lexicon:

5315 nephesh-

- soul-self,, life, a creature, a person, an appetite, a mind, a living being, a desire, an emotion, a passion
- what breathes, the breathing substance or being, a soul, the inner being of man
- a living being
- a living being (with life in the blood)
- the man himself, a-self, a person or an individual
- the seat of the appetites
- the seat of emotions and passions
- the activity of mind
- the activity of the will
- the activity of the character

My whole life I was told that I was “saved” by the blood of Jesus, yet Leviticus tells me that atonement which brings salvation is accomplished by my life before God!

Looking at the definition above, one quickly sees that the activity of one’s will, mind, and character [one’s soul] was said to be accepted in Leviticus 17 as an atonement for one’s sin [life and not blood remember?].

Jesus, like all Jewish people who came before him who were devoted to God and His Torah, as well as those who lived after him, comprise the “suffering servant Israel”. Let us remember that Isa. 53 speaks of the nation and corporate Israel as the Suffering Servant and not an individual even if singular pronouns are often used among plural pronouns. It is this “Suffering Servant” who is “the” light for the non-Jewish nations. With this perspective, we now can come to understand that the blood of Jesus carried the life force of Jesus (his soul). Jesus was totally committed and surrendered to the will of God and His Torah. That instead of Jesus’ death, in reality it was his life, a life lived pleasing to God as part of the Israel of God which God accepted as atonement

for sin. In particular Israel is the priest for the Gentile world, and they bring sacrifices for the sins of the Gentile world. **THINK!** Israel's "soul", not only Yeshua's, but all of righteous Israel, past and future, "atones" for sin. These righteous lives are accepted by Hashem on the altar, according to Leviticus 17, as atonement for sin, the sin of the Gentile nations who know not God. Such in reality "atones and saves". When I as a non-Jew comes to the knowledge of God and His commandments, then when lived before Him I identify with Israel and join Israel in making atonement with my life.

Remembering what we have already learned...that singular pronouns in the Servant Songs of Isaiah refer to the nation of Israel and not to only one person like Jesus. In so doing we can find the following verses even the more astonishing.

Isaiah 53:6

6 We all went astray like sheep, we have turned, each one on his own way, and **the Lord accepted his [the corporate nation of Israel] prayers for the iniquity of all of us.**

Now let us never again under estimate the importance of the prayer service in the Jewish synagogues of the world for by it atonement came for Gentile sins.

Now it become a little more clear. When one looks at Jesus, or other righteous Jews as the Suffering Servant of the LORD, then we see their lives and understand them as "lights to the nations". Then it is easy to understand such righteous lives and deaths as lives lived as examples which were in complete submission to the Commandments of God as demonstrated by one's complete submission of the mind, will, and emotions to God and His desires for his people. **Such examples when followed by me, literally "saves"! Such lives atoned for sins of the Gentile world and serve as an example to me and you...by which if we follow such examples....provides atonement for our sins.** Literally the "corporate" example of Israel is to be individualize in each believer's life when one comes into personal relationship with God. **This is explained when one reads Isaiah 53 from the Jewish Scriptures and not the corrupted Christian Old Testament.**

Jesus lived a God-honoring life to such a degree that God accepted his life, as he had all Jews devoted to Him. In Jesus' life God could tabernacle in a way He never had before with any man and the "Word/Messiah became flesh" at the immersion and anointing of Jesus. Let us never forget that Israel has had many "anointed" (messiahs) messengers of God as was Jesus. Then subsequently his God-honoring life (soul) was later accepted as an offering for sin in behalf of mankind as had others of Israel before him (and those of Israel who would follow him). His soul was pure and could be accepted upon the altar of God in lieu of us. God accepted his prayers for the iniquity of us .

Luke 23:34

34 Then said Jesus, Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do... (KJV)

So it was not Jesus' death so much as his God-honoring life-style which was lived in complete submission to the Father and His Commandments which not only brought Jesus to tabernacle within God "without measure", but shows us the way to both live and die in a way which honors both man and God and procures for us our atonement when we live our lives by his example. The death of Yeshua was not so much a sacrifice for us but an example for us.

BUT IN A WAY THE "BLOOD" OF JESUS DID SAVE US....IF WE CAN SEE THE TRUTH OF WHAT HE TAUGHT?

Had Jesus not died then there most likely would not have been a movement catalyzed from within a Gentile

hating Judaism of the 2nd Temple period which would reach out to the nations with the Torah and the Laws of Noah. The death, where the blood of Jesus was shed, was the catalyst that caused a mission into all the world where the Covenant of Noah was extended to the Gentile World. We call this the Great Commission today. Now understand which is said next. For in the wake of Yeshua's death would come a movement into all the world which aimed at taking the Torah to the nations whereby non-Jews could learn how to live lives pleasing to God as had Israel through faith and acceptance of the commands of God respective of their Covenant. Messianic Israel took to the non-Jews and the Lost Sheep of the House of Israel God's Covenant made with the non-Jews since before Noah. Faith and obedience to the Covenant stipulations brought salvation to the non-Jewish world. In others words Jesus traded his life for ours as previous Suffering Servants of God had done in preserving the truths of God for all mankind, and God accepted the bargain. This understanding is what Isaiah understood about the sacrifice of the Suffering Servant. Because of the death of Jesus, and I believe his resurrection, the teachings by which non-Jews could enter Covenant with God and live by the Commandments of God was to be taken into all the world. Along with these teachings would come the understanding that repentance from sin and a return to God provides a life pleasing to God which He then accepts as atonement for sin. Through the ages of the Christian Gentile Church this teaching was lost! Your example of being a Christian today which does not understand the sacrificial system of the Bible is proof.

Now you are ready to read our articles on Isaiah to fully understand [Isa. 53](#) correctly

The vast majority of Christians in the world today have not been told this and wander in fables because they lack the correct understanding which only can come from in-depth Bible study. And you have to have the right text before you start. Sadly Christians for the most part cannot find the truth because they are working from a corrupted text. They only reinforce error. Buy yourself a Stone Edition Tanakh. Then you will have the Bible Yeshua used.

So it was the Suffering Servant, Israel, composed of many Israelites, whose lives lived daily in complete obedience to their God which was so pleasing to God that they could be accepted by God as an offering for sin and not their red corpuscles (blood) which Christianity sadly focuses. **And the Lord accepted his [the corporate nation of Israel] prayers for the iniquity of all of us. What makes this even more remarkable is that in this very passage from Isa. 53 it is the GENTILE KINGS OF THE WORLD SPEAKING & NOT THE JEWISH PEOPLE OR THE JEWISH PROPHETS!** The Gentiles will one day understand the role played by the righteous Jewish people in expiation of their sin! **This is prophetic** but you can fulfill it today if you open your heart and head to the facts presented in this article.

Such is the teaching of Isaiah and Leviticus.

Because of the proliferation of bloody rites in Gentile paganism, the Gentile converts to Jewish Christianity would in the first centuries, inherently revert back to pagan backgrounds. Thus the emphasis today on blood instead of a God-honoring life as the offering for sin has been inherited by the Gentile Church. Such falsehoods as taught by Paul was a "bridge" to the non-Jewish nations as he attempted to "be all things to all that he might win some". Paul gave the non-Jew nothing more than what they already had; for in the pagan mystery religions, of which Troas was the capital of Mithraism, Paul's home town, the old pagan concepts were rolled into Jesus by Paul for Gentile acceptance. They did not have to accept Judaism per se, he would simply remold Jesus into a neo-pagan to which they could relate. Such is the reckless acts of one desperately trying to be received and accepted because of his rejection by the Jerusalem Church. When Jerusalem would be notified of what Paul was teaching, he would be repeatedly summoned to answer charges. Finally, in Acts 21 he was arrested, but his submission to the Jerusalem church was never in question. They just never accepted "Paul's" gospel. Neither should you! Paul's gospel could not "preach" in Israel, only 1500 miles away when few knew little of a Jewish Jesus or the Torah. Such a clever tactic by Paul only made Yeshua the head of the non-Jewish pantheon which were already filled with pagan gods which gave their body and blood for their followers for salvation. SUCH A TEACHING AS SHARED BY PAUL

IS NOT JEWISH NOR IS SUCH A TEACHING BIBLICAL! IT IS PAGAN TO ITS CORE AND YOU NEED TO KNOW THAT! JAMES AND THE JERUSALEM CHURCH DID! The whole sorry affair can be seen as I have detailed it in this web-site if you read it thoroughly.

I just gave you the Biblical teaching on atonement.

Answer for yourself: Have you noticed we have not discussed “sin offerings” yet but have covered the gamut of atonement? Sin offerings only began after the terrible sin of idolatry and blasphemy of the Name of the LORD when Israel rejected YHVH at Sinai. Now God would add a new law that had not existed prior to that time. Request our article on “The Law That Was Added” to further your understanding in this area.

NOW...WHAT ABOUT SIN OFFERINGS?

Really I don't have much to say except they were instituted after the golden calf incident. Then a whole priesthood and tabernacle was required. But even looking at sin offerings, the same spiritual dynamics that we have learned are applied; namely, the soul or life of the sacrificer is placed on the altar as a picture of his renewed relationship with God and the accuracy of such a demonstration was determined if he had repented, confessed, and made restitution PRIOR to bringing the sacrifice.

CONCLUSION

Having now come to the understanding that it was a life lived above sin that was so pleasing to God that God accepted such a life as an offering and atonement for one's sin, it should behoove you to rethink what you believe about atonement as a Christian. If you were to do some comparative religious study you will see the preponderance of evidence of how pagan concepts of salvation are woven into Pauline theology. I have shown you the Biblical teachings of atonement and have not mentioned Paul's theology once. **The reason I have not is that nowhere in the Jewish Masoretic Palestinian text are such Pauline concepts of atonement found.**

Only when you read the fraudulent and mistranslated Greek Scriptures, which the Rabbis did not translate, do you begin to find such ideas surfacing in the text. But never fail to understand that such concepts cannot be found in the Jewish Scriptures from which the Greek translation emanated. Somebody “fixed” the Greek translation to read differently. **And sadly for you, these altered and paganized Greek mistranslation became the foundation for your Christian Old Testament. To make matters worse, your New Testament quotes from the fraudulent Old Testament.** Over and over as you read your Christian Bible you only reinforce and rehearse error! You need to know that. But that happened over 2000 years ago and who knows? Well I do, and others do who have studied enough to see it! The Jews have always known. It is the secularized Jews of today who don't. It is time someone told you! The righteous Jews know this and have known this since 200 BC when the Greek translation was understood by them to be a corruption of the Jewish Scriptures. History records 3 attempts of the Jews to correct such a forged Greek translation but sadly their efforts were not to overtake the popularity of the already translated LXX (Septuagint).

Understand an animal's soul represented the soul of one making the sacrifice, and we, as non-Jews, today are beneficiaries of having the Jew's prayers for our sin on Yom Kippur. Jesus is the archetype for all of Israel. But in this lesson we must no longer overlook the importance of a life lived above sin which procures one's redemption and not the inert blood of the animal or of Jesus. **Lives lived honoring God through faith and obedience atones. Your Covenant requires it!** Such is the message of Bet Emet as we are called to live like Jesus and not just “believe in Jesus.” It has been my experience as a Pastor over the years to encounter multitudes of Christians who trust in Christ's blood instead of understanding the importance of his life, symbolized by his soul in his blood, as lived in obedience to God as a form of atonement, or even their own lives, as lived pleasing to God for their OWN atonement. **We must walk out our salvation with fear and**

trembling. We are co-laborers with God in our own salvation through faith and repentance. Such a mistaken understanding of our redemption as seen from Paul, since not being taught the truth from a Hebraic perspective, has caused multitudes of Christians to trust in the acclaimed miraculous powers of the blood of Jesus instead of focusing of the miraculousness of a life lived above sin. Such a false sense of security in “blood” instead of “lives lived holy before God and man” unconsciously causes the believer to not regard sin with revulsion as he should. We tend to view sin as less harmful than it is, and compromise with sin which lies at the door.

The bottom line for all Christians to understand is that we have heard way too much preached *about* Jesus and far too little studied from the texts of the Jewish Bible which tell us exactly and accurately who he is as well as his original mission. If we had studied the original sources available to us, we would not be so mixed up theologically in a Christianity today which boasts over 2000 different denominations all maintaining they have the truth about Jesus while at the same time being the most violent and crime ridden nation in the world.

***SOMETHING IS WRONG WITH THE MESSAGE OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...LOOK AT THE FRUIT OF THIS MESSAGE IN OUR COUNTRY WITH A CHURCH ON EVERY CORNER AND TELEVISIONS FILLED WITH THE CHRISTIAN MESSAGE. JUST LOOK OUT YOUR DOOR AND ASK IF THAT IS THE BEST THE HOLY SPIRIT CAN DO??
??????***

May God forgive our laziness to let others tell us what to believe instead of us studying to show ourselves approved unto God. I just showed you part of the problem. Implicitly we are led to not revere the Laws and Commandments of God because “Jesus died for me” and my get out of jail card saves me. As a Pastor I saw such falsehoods lived out in the lives of the congregation year after year. When there is no Law, no Commandments, no requirements, no accountability, then there is no righteous fruit and we have our newspapers filled with horror story after horror story and many of these atrocities are being committed by clergy.

Answer for yourself: When was the last time you saw a Rabbi skip off with the funds of the synagogue or be caught with a prostitute? When was the last time a Rabbi was found molesting a child? Are they any different that non-Jews; or is it because they have a fear of God that is lacking in the Christian Church because we have "implicitly" been sold a bill of goods that we are "already" forgiven and can get away with it because "Jesus paid it all?"

And sadly few can count on their lives being a sufficient atonement for their sin when your whole life the Church has taught you to live without Law and the Commandments of God. This the legacy of Paul and his mystery religions superimposed upon a Rabbi names Yeshua/Jesus. You were taught these "laws and commandments" were a curse. Emotionalism is a sorry substitute for knowledge.

Answer for yourself: For after all if saved by the blood of Jesus, what need do I have to live like Jesus and not disobey the commandments of God? Isn't Jesus my “grace card” that allows me to live anyway I want to and not fear the end-result of such non-accountable behavior?

Answer for yourself: If saved by the blood of another, what does a little sin mean...what can it hurt; for after all, did not Jesus die for me as the Roman document ...the New Testament states?

Answer for yourself: See the tragic thinking involved in focusing upon the blood of Jesus instead of the life of Jesus lived above sin?

THINK!

Shalom.



20% off
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #6

IS BLOOD REQUIRED TO ATONE FOR SIN?

"...without the shedding of blood there is no forgiveness." (Hebrews 9:22)

Answer for yourself: Is this statement from the epistle to the Hebrews really true or is it a contradiction of the Eternal Word of God and the Bible Jesus used?

The central theme of Christianity and the New Testament (NT) is the sacrificial offering of the blood of 'Jesus Christ' as atonement for the sins of the entire world. "The blood of 'Jesus' was shed in our stead and is the **only means of atonement for sin.**"

Answer for yourself: Is this claim truly consistent with The Holy Scriptures (OT)?

Before you say "yes" you might possibly need to be honest with yourself by answering this question: "Just how well do I really know the Old Testament Scriptures and their meanings since I am a New Testament Christian?"

Christians claim that the absolute need for blood is rooted in the Law of Moses (the Torah). Traditionally they will often cite the book of Leviticus as proof:

"And whatever man of the house of Israel, or of the strangers who sojourn among you, who consumes any blood, I will set My face against that person who consumes blood, and will cut him off from among his people. For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you upon the altar to make atonement for your souls; **for it is the blood that makes an atonement for the soul.** Therefore, I say to the children of Israel, 'No one among you shall consume blood, nor shall any stranger who sojourns among you consume blood.'" (Leviticus 17:11)

What should immediately be apparent is that this passage is concerned first and foremost with the **prohibition against consuming blood. The subject of atonement here is secondary.** We are told that the reason for this prohibition is that the blood contains the life or vitality of the animal. Strong's number 3722 is the Hebrew word "Kaphar"; Gesenius' Hebrew-Chaldee Lexicon explains this to mean (1) to cover over, to over spread as with pitch. (2) to obtain forgiveness. (3) to make expiation for an offender, to free him from charge.

Another reason is that consuming blood was a very important part of the idolatrous religious practices of the people and nations surrounding Israel (Gen. 9:4 and Deut. 12:23).

Israel was clearly instructed by The Holy One of Israel through Moses not to imitate this abhorrent pagan practice **in any manner (and this has serious implications for Christian communion, both Catholic and Protestant).** Although the actual blood was later to be substituted with wine in many of the sacred banquets of pagan religions, there is ample evidence to support the claim that literal blood was consumed as part of the

ritual worship of pagan deities, and this as a form of atonement.

Please listen to this! Since this passage from Lev. 17 is predominately concerned with the prohibition against consuming blood, we must look elsewhere in the Bible for instructions concerning atonement for sins. This passage in Leviticus will become clearer later on. The passage does say that since blood symbolizes the life of the animal, it can be used as a means of atoning for our sins. It does not say, however, that blood is the only means of atoning for sins. Indeed, The Holy Scriptures tell us of several other things that can be used instead of the blood of a sacrificial ram or bullock.

OTHER MEANS OF ATONEMENT.....IS THIS NEWS TO YOU?

"And Moses said unto Aaron, 'Take a censer, and put fire therein from off the altar, and put on incense, and go quickly unto the congregation, and make an atonement for them: for there is wrath gone out from [YHVH]; the plague is begun.' And Aaron took as Moses commanded, and ran into the midst of the congregation; and, behold, the plague was begun among the people: and he put on incense, and made an atonement for the people." (Numbers 16:46-47)

Here, incense can be used to atone for sins in the same manner as the blood sacrifices of animals.

Notice what else could be used in place of blood:

"The rich shall not give more, and the poor shall not give less than half a shekel (offering of money), when they give an offering unto [YHVH], to make an atonement for your souls. And thou shalt take the atonement money of the children of Israel, and shalt appoint it for the service of the tabernacle of the congregation; that it may be a memorial unto the children of Israel before [YHVH], to make an atonement for your souls." (Exodus 30:15-16)

Here, one's offering to the LORD can be used to atone for sins in the same manner as the blood sacrifices of animals.

The phrase "to make atonement for your souls" in these verses is the same expression as in Leviticus 17:11:

"We have therefore brought an oblation [again items of worth and money] (Deut. 12:23-25, 30) for [YHVH], what every man hath gotten, of jewels of gold, chains, and bracelets, rings, earrings, and tablets, to make an atonement for our souls before [YHVH]." Numbers 31:50)

In these passages, money could be used to make atonement for the children of Israel. The principle here is not that atonement can be bought [this was the practice of the great universal church whose priests routinely sold forgiveness]. Rather, this is about doing charitable things with money. In this case, the money was to be used for the physical maintenance of the temple building.

DOES BLOOD COVER ALL SIN?

According to the Bible, blood sacrifices held only limited atonement capabilities. Foremost among it's limitations was that blood sacrifices were only brought for unintentional sins. If a person committed some sin out of ignorance, such as doing work on the Sabbath when perhaps they mistakenly thought it was Sunday, then atonement could be made through a sacrificial sin offering. Sacrifices did

not help to atone for sins that were done intentionally. Notice the instructions to the priests concerning this:

"And [YHVH] spake unto Moses, saying, Speak unto the children of Israel, saying, If a soul shall sin **through ignorance** against any of the commandments of [YHVH] concerning things which ought not to be done, and shall do against any of them: If the priest that is anointed do sin according to the sin of the people; then let him bring for his sin, which he hath sinned, a young bullock without blemish unto [YHVH] for a sin offering. And he shall bring the bullock unto the door of the tabernacle of the congregation before [YHVH]; and shall lay his hand upon the bullock's head, and kill the bullock before [YHVH]. And the priest that is anointed shall take of the bullock's blood, and bring it to the tabernacle of the congregation: And the priest shall dip his finger in the blood, and sprinkle of the blood seven times before [YHVH], before the veil of the sanctuary. **And the priest shall put some of the blood upon the horns of the altar** of sweet incense before [YHVH], which is in the tabernacle of the congregation; and shall pour all the blood of the bullock at the bottom of the altar of the burnt offering, which is at the door of the tabernacle of the congregation" Leviticus 4:1-7)

This claim that only blood could atone for sins raises many questions. What happens if someone could not afford to purchase a ram or bullock for his sin offering? Is it possible that a loving CREATOR would institute a system of atonement that could only be used by the wealthy?

"And if he be not able to bring a lamb, then he shall bring for his trespass, which he hath committed, **two turtledoves, or two young pigeons**, unto [YHVH]; one for a sin offering, and the other for a burnt offering." Leviticus 5:7)

Here, if a person could not afford the sacrificial ram or bullock for a sin offering, certain types of small birds could be used instead.

Answer for yourself: However, what if someone was so destitute, that he couldn't afford even these small birds?

"But if his means are insufficient for two turtledoves or two young pigeons, then for his offering for that which he has sinned, he shall bring the tenth of an ephah of **fine flour for a sin offering**; he shall not put oil on it or place incense on it, for it is a sin offering." (Leviticus 5:11)

This is very interesting, but seriously damaging to the Christian doctrine. If birds could not be afforded, some simple flour could be used instead and would be **just as effective** in the eyes of Israel's CREATOR. The scriptures are quite clear on this. Since **flour** could be used for a sin offering, **it is evident that blood was not the sole means of atonement.** The Christian position that only the shed blood of 'Jesus' could atone for sins is falling by the wayside in light of the Holy Scriptures. Actually, considering the beating and torture which 'Jesus' is said to have suffered at The hands of the Romans, **you have to wonder why he didn't just bring a sack of flour to the Romans and let them whip, beat, mock and crucify it instead!!!**

WHAT IF THERE WAS NO TEMPLE OR AARONIC PRIEST ...HOW WAS ATONEMENT ACHIEVED?

While the Temple stood, sacrifices without question served as part of the atonement process. If you read the first articles in this series then you understand the meaning of the presentation of the "blood" on the altar within the Temple.

Answer for yourself: What, though, was to be the fate of the people who did not have access to the Temple?

Answer for yourself: What were the Israelite people supposed to do after 586 B.C.E. when the first Temple was destroyed and they were exiled to Babylon?

Answer for yourself: What did the Jewish people do in the times of the Maccabees when the Syrian-Greeks were in control of the Temple and did not allow sacrifices?

After king Solomon completed the spectacular temple building in Jerusalem, he dedicated it with a very moving speech. This lengthy and very beautiful speech can be read in the books of 1 Kings 8 and II Chronicles 6. Notice, however, that Solomon **doesn't speak about sacrifices at all!** If sacrifices were the focal point of the temple, this omission would be very curious. Rather, the focus of the Temple was shown to be the Ark, containing the Laws which our CREATOR wanted us to live by. The Temple was first and foremost a symbol of the Shechinah, or presence of The Holy One of Israel.

"I have surely built thee an house to dwell in, a settled place for thee to abide in for ever. (I Kings 8:13)

"And let them make me a sanctuary; that I may dwell among them" (Exodus 25:8).

Toward the end of the speech, Solomon addresses the subject of the Israelite people being denied access to the temple:

"If they return to You with all their heart and with all their soul in the land of their enemies who have taken them captive, and **pray to You** toward their land which You have given to their fathers, the city which You have chosen, and the house which I have built for Your name; then hear their prayer and their supplication in heaven Your dwelling place, and maintain their cause, and **forgive Your people** who have sinned against You and all their transgressions which they have transgressed against You..." (I Kings 8:46-50)

This passage helps us understand Leviticus 17:11 properly. **The Bible clearly teaches that blood sacrifices were not necessary in order to atone for sins. Prayer and repentance are shown to be the effective means of atonement. Certainly, when the Temple stood, and if one could afford an animal, a sacrifice was brought as part of the atonement process for unintentional sins. What Leviticus 17:11 teaches us is that when we bring such an animal as a sacrifice, we are not allowed to consume its blood, because as the life force, it is the part of the animal that affects our atonement.** In addition, we were not to consume the blood because this was the practice of the pagan people who worshipped the sun-god 'baal.'

WAS YESHUA AN ACCEPTABLE SACRIFICE?

Another focal point of the NT is the Christian claim that the crucifixion of 'Jesus' served as the **final atoning sacrifice for the sins of the world**. However, if the sacrificial instructions set forth by the Law of Moses are examined closely, and you see the guidelines set forth for how sacrifices are to be brought, **it will be clear that 'Jesus' could never serve as an atoning sacrifice. Clearly, not just any blood shed in any manner would satisfy the biblical requirements for atonement. Notice the instructions set forth in the Torah concerning sacrifices:**

"For the life of the flesh is in the blood, and I have given it to you **upon the altar** to make an atonement for your souls..." (Lev. 17:11)

Notice that the blood of the acceptable sacrifice was to be shed **upon the holy alter of the temple**, and not on the pagan phallic symbol of the cross. Besides Yeshua died on a stake without a crossbar as was customary of the Romans. Clearly, not just any spilled blood is acceptable as a sacrifice. YHVH set forth very meticulous rules and laws governing acceptable sacrifices brought to Him. "Jesus'" crucifixion may qualify as an atonement according to the **Greek Testament of Mithraism** but since his blood was **not offered on the altar**, it is not in compliance with what The Holy Scriptures of Israel's CREATOR requires.

There are many other factors that would render the crucifixion of 'Jesus' an unacceptable sacrifice according to scriptural guidelines. According to the Biblical rules in Leviticus, all sacrifices had to be offered **by a Levite**

Priest, a descendant of Aaron. According to the "gospel" accounts, 'Jesus' was killed by pagan, gentile Roman soldiers.

Biblical law also prohibited any sacrifice that was blemished or maimed:

"Ye shall offer at your own will a male without blemish, of the beeves, of the sheep, or of the goats. But whatsoever hath a blemish, that shall ye not offer: for it shall **not** be acceptable for you. And whosoever offereth a sacrifice of peace offerings unto [YHVH] to accomplish his vow, or a freewill offering in beeves or sheep, it shall be perfect to be accepted; there shall be no blemish therein. Blind, or broken, or maimed, or having a wen [cyst], or scurvy, or scabbed, ye shall not offer these unto [YHVH], nor make an offering by fire of them upon the altar unto [YHVH]. (Leviticus 22:19-21).

Now we have a problem. The "gospels" of the NT clearly teach that 'Jesus' was beaten and whipped, which would have made him blemished and maimed and therefore an unfit sacrifice. Frequently, Christians react to this line of reasoning by protesting that it is improper to be so literal, and that "Jesus'" death was more of a symbolic or spiritual sacrifice. Christians will insist, indeed the NT itself makes the claim, that 'Jesus' was literally our Passover sacrifice. Remember in the book of John, when the Roman soldiers pierced 'Jesus' [after he was already dead, mind you]? Here we are told that they did not break his legs because this would violate the rules of the proper Passover sacrifice (Matthew 27:26, Mark 15:19, and John 19:3). The legs of the crucified were sometimes broken to hasten death. It was necessary that crucifixion victims must prop themselves up using their legs in order to facilitate breathing. This could prolong death for days at times. The legs were broken so that proper breathing could be prevented, and the lungs crushed the diaphragm and breathing was extremely difficult.:

"But coming to 'Jesus,' when they saw that he was already dead, they did not break his legs ...in order that the Scripture might be fulfilled: Not a bone of him shall be broken." (John 19:33-36)

The gospel of John portrays 'Jesus' as the Passover lamb which was not supposed to have any of its bones broken (cf. Exodus 12:46, Numbers 9:12). If Christians insist that 'Jesus' was the literal Passover sacrifice, and his blood atoned for our sins, then 'Jesus,' as that sacrifice, was subject to the literal guidelines set by the Law of Moses given by CREATOR of Israel governing an acceptable sacrifice. Christians always seem to want to have it both ways. The NT itself proposes that 'Jesus' was a literal sacrifice. When confronted with the clear Biblical instructions on how acceptable sacrifices were to be offered, however, they will complain that this is just legalistic nit picking.

You may wonder why I present this material to you, our readers. Simply, knowing what I know and what I have uncovered which is not taught to the Christian Church but which Jews seem to have always known, behooves me to share it with my brothers and sisters in hopes that they might learn as well the truth behind the New Testament and repent thereby accepting the true faith of Yeshua. Such honors God and guarantees acceptance when we die. More to follow. Shalom.



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #7

WHY WAS YESHUA PATTERNED AFTER THE PASSOVER SACRIFICE...SHOULD IT NOT HAVE BEEN YOM KIPPUR?

It really does not make sense to type 'Jesus' as the Passover sacrifice anyway. We know from Exodus 12 that the Passover sacrifice did not serve as atonement for sins, it merely commemorates the exodus from Egypt. Even when the lamb was slaughtered in Egypt and its' blood smeared on the door-posts, the blood did not serve to atone for the sins of anyone. It was a sign for the angel of death to pass over Israelite homes during the plague of the first born. The only people in danger were first-born males. The blood wasn't a help to other people in the family, and didn't serve as an atonement for the first born or save the mothers or sisters of any family.

It would have made much more sense to type 'Jesus' after the Yom Kippur (Day of Atonement) sacrifice, which actually was an atonement for the sins of all the people. The problem here was that according to Leviticus 16:10, 21-22, the animal that atoned for the sins of the nation was not killed, but sent live out into the desert. (THINK)...it was not killed...it lived...as we saw earlier in the real Isaiah...."life" atones..not death!

Now the followers of 'Jesus' had another problem. According to the prophecies of ancient Israel, the Messiah was not supposed to die before completing His mission. The followers of 'Jesus,' who claimed that he was Israel's Messiah, now had to deal with 'Jesus'' embarrassing death at the hands of the Romans. So they correlated him with the slain Passover sacrifice. This tap dance around the scriptures to try and legitimize 'Jesus' as the Messiah cannot negate the clear lesson from Leviticus and the Day of Atonement that the shedding of blood is not a pre-requisite for atonement.

CAN YESHUA OR ANY OTHER PERSON ATONE FOR YOUR SINS?

Answer for yourself: Where did this idea originate that one man, or that anyone for that matter, could atone and pay for the sins of one or more people?

Maybe you don't know or have never read on the subject. Many don't and have not done adequate study to know the answer. Others have. It should be perfectly clear to you, if you have ever looked into the subject, that such notions stem from the Babylonian mystery religion of ancient Mesopotamia. The Greeks and Romans, as well as their ancestors, had multiple legends whereby heroes died for followers, cities, friends, for the law, for the truth, etc. Many such "deaths" were thought to bring atonement to those who believed in such sacrificial acts. This is fact when can be demonstrable to anyone who inquires.

What is certain is that the idea that an innocent person can be killed instead of those who are guilty is not consistent with what the Bible teaches. After the sin of the Golden Calf, YHVH was so outraged that His intentions were to totally annihilate and destroy the Israelite people. Moses offers to die in their place. Notice the response to Moses suggestion:

"Yet now, if thou wilt forgive their sin...; and if not, blot me, I pray thee, out of thy book which thou hast written. And [YHWH] said unto Moses, **Whosoever hath sinned against me, him will I blot out of my book.**" (Exodus 32:32-33)

Throughout the Bible, YHVH says that one person **cannot die for the sins of another:**

"Fathers shall not be put to death for their sons, nor shall sons be put to death for their fathers; everyone shall be put to death for his own sin"
(Deuteronomy 24:16)

"But everyone will die for his own sin; each man who eats sour grapes, his teeth will be set on edge" (Jeremiah 31:30)

"The person who sins will die. The son will not bear the punishment for the father's iniquity, nor will the father bear the punishment for the son's iniquity; the righteousness of the righteous will be upon himself, and the wickedness of the wicked will be upon himself" (Ezekiel 18:20)

"He who justifies the wicked, and he who condemns the righteous, both of them are an abomination to the Lord" (Proverbs 17:15).

"No man ['Jesus' included] can by any means redeem his brother, or give to 'God' a ransom for him" (Psalms 49:7)

Unlike the Greek Testament in the Christian Bible, The Holy Scriptures of the One True CREATOR of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob clearly teach that we are responsible for our own actions and sins. We alone must account and pay the price. God does not change! No virgin born savior deity from Babylonian mythology can contradict the clear instructions of CREATOR of Israel.

Answer for yourself: Why are there two theologies concerning atonement in your Bible; one in the Old Testament by the God of Israel who says He changes not, and then the Pauline corpus of material in the New Testament that contradicts it by paralleling pagan mystery religions and their false atonements of their false gods? This is very evident when the Old Testament is compared with the NT, and if you say you never saw it dear one you never looked deep enough for it is there!

NOW FOR THE REALLY BIG QUESTION

Here is a question that Christian ministers have danced around for two thousand years, but have never truthfully answered. This question bothered me all the years I pastored.

Answer for yourself: If indeed 'Jesus' came as the final sacrifice to atone for the sins of the world, **why do The**

Holy Scriptures proclaim that the Third Temple will be built and sacrifices resumed during the Messianic era?

The vast majority of average Christians are completely ignorant of these prophecies, as they have been cleverly hidden by their ministers. **Notice the clear teachings of The Holy Scriptures regarding this:**

"Even those I will bring to My holy mountain, and make them joyful in My house of prayer. Their burnt offerings and their sacrifices will be acceptable on My altar; for My house will be called a house of prayer for all the peoples." (Isaiah 56:7)

"From beyond the rivers of Ethiopia My worshipers, My dispersed ones will bring My offerings." (Zephaniah 3:10)

"All the flocks of Kedar will be gathered together to you, the rams of Nebaioth will minister to you; they will go up with acceptance on My altar, and I shall glorify My glorious house." (Isaiah 60:7)

"And I will make a covenant of peace with them; it will be an everlasting covenant with them. And I will place them and multiply them, and will set My **sanctuary** in their midst forever." (Ezekiel 37:26)

"And He will sit as a smelter and purifier of silver, and He will purify the sons of Levi and refine them like gold and silver, so that they may present to [YHWH] **offerings in righteousness**. Then the offering of Judah and Jerusalem will be pleasant to [YHWH], **as in the days of old and as in former years.**" (Malachi 3:3-4)

LET THERE BE NO DOUBT

(Ezekiel 45:17) "And it shall be the princes part to provide the burnt offerings, the grain offerings, and the libations...**to make the atonement for the house of Israel.**"

Apparently, dear reader, **'Jesus' sacrifice did not make atonement for the sins of all the world.** If the death of 'Jesus' had atoned for all sins for all time, why will atonement need to be made during the messianic era?

Answer for yourself: How do you answer the true words of Israel's CREATOR, Mr. Christian minister? These questions caused me to study like I never had to find the answers. The root of the whole problem lies in the texts and their authority. As a Christian Pastor I came to realize after many years of serious study following Seminary that the New Testament was little more than a propagandist Roman document full of anti-Semitic ideas and teachings. Considering all the manuscripts available to day totally a little less than 6000 pieces, there are over 300,000 contradictions and no two are "identical" or "read the same". Surely God could do better. As if that was not enough, my heart broke within me when I discovered my KJV Old Testament was a purposefully falsified and altered translation of the Jewish Masoretic text which had been "doctored" as had the New Testament. It took over ten years to substantiate these discrepancies beyond any doubt and were a major factor in my resignation from my Pastorate. I was an ordained Pastor of an apostate faith. Such shame no man can know. I had believed "the" lie and the "very elect" was deceived. I accepted everything on "faith" never questioning anything. I was gullible for the LORD until YHVH put in my heart and head the desire to study out the conflicting errors of my Christian theology. The fruit I lay before you for your inspection as a gift to God and as a love offering in hopes your hunger for truth is greater than your commitment to tradition.

YHVH AND MERCY

The Christian claim that only through bloodshed can atonement be made show that Christians are unfamiliar with how compassionate and merciful the Holy One of Israel really is. Sometimes, He forgives us simply because He is kind, loving, compassionate and merciful. Even when we don't seek our LORD appropriately, He has the ability to reach out to us with love and forgive us:

"Who is a [Elohiym] like unto thee, that pardoneth iniquity, and passeth by the transgression of the remnant of his heritage? He retaineth not His anger for ever, because He delighteth in mercy." (Micah 7:18)

"Their heart was not steadfast toward Him, nor were they faithful in His covenant. But He, being compassionate, forgave their iniquity...remembering that they were but flesh." (Psalms 78:36-39)

"You have not brought Me the sheep of your burnt offerings...or the fat of your sacrifices, but you have burdened Me with your sins...Nevertheless, I will wipe out your transgressions for My own sake, and I will not remember your sins." (Isaiah 43:23-25)

Truly, truly the Holy one of Israel is a just and merciful CREATOR.

WHAT DO THE PROPHETS HAVE TO SAY?

Answer for yourself: If the Christian claim that one must be covered by the shed blood of the Messiah in order to make atonement for his sins is valid, why can this claim not be validated by the writings of the prophets?

Time and time again, the writings of the prophets emphasize prayer and repentance as the method to atone for sins. I challenge any Christian to produce a scripture from Unaltered Holy Hebrew Scriptures (OT that Jesus used) that teaches us that we must believe in the atoning blood of a Messiah in order to obtain salvation [even the Christian Bible does not say it]. What the prophets teach us is that our own obedience to the laws of Israel's CREATOR combined with sincere repentance and prayer for forgiveness will atone for sin if done with the proper attitude of humility.

- "That every man will turn from his evil way, then I will forgive their iniquity and their sin." (Jeremiah 36:3)
- "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts, and let him return to [YHWH], and He will have compassion on him; and to our [Elohiym]. for He will abundantly pardon." (Isaiah 55:7)
- "And if My people who are called by My name humble themselves and pray, and seek My face and turn from their wicked ways, then I will hear from heaven, will forgive their sin, and will heal their land." (II Chronicles 7:14).
- "But if the wicked man turns from all his sins which he has committed and observes all My statutes and practices justice and righteousness, he shall surely live; he shall not die. All his transgressions which he has committed will not be remembered against him; because of the righteousness which he has practiced he shall live...When a wicked man turns away from his wickedness which he has committed and practices justice and righteousness, he will save his life...Repent and turn away from all your transgressions, so that iniquity may not become a stumbling block to you (Ezekiel 18:21- 22,27,30).
- "By loving kindness and truth iniquity is atoned for..." (Proverbs 16:6).
- "If you return to [Elohiym] you will be restored; if you remove unrighteousness far from your tent...then you will delight in [Elohiym]..." (Job 22:23-27).

Clearly, the central teaching of The Holy Scriptures is that we must break away from our sinful past and sincerely repent. This is the only way to restore our relationship with the Holy One of Israel. If one strays from the path set forth by the laws of our God, one must repent and return to the path. This is how forgiveness is obtained. Even when sacrifices were offered, they in and of themselves did not effect atonement. You now have seen that in the first articles in this series. The sacrifice was part of the process but only a "picture" of the sacrificer after his repentance. What is repentance? Returning to ETERNAL by forsaking our evil ways and praying for forgiveness. The prophets were constantly correcting the Israelite people for relying on blood sacrifices as the essential element of atonement instead of or without

repentance and obedience to ETERNAL's laws:

- "What are your multiplied sacrifices to Me? says [YHWH]. I have had enough of burnt offerings of rams, and the fat of fed cattle. And I take no pleasure in the blood of bulls, lambs, or goats...Wash yourselves, make yourselves clean; remove the evil of your deeds from My sight. Cease to do evil, learn to do good; seek justice, reprove the ruthless, defend the orphan, plead for the widow. Come let us reason together says [YHWH], 'Though your sins are as scarlet, they will be white as snow; though they be red like crimson, they will be like wool, if you consent and obey...' (Isaiah 1:11-18).
- "The sacrifice of the wicked is an abomination to the Lord." (Proverbs 15:8).
- "To do righteousness and justice is more acceptable to [YHWH] than sacrifice." (Proverbs 21:3)
- "For I delight in loyalty rather than sacrifice, and in the knowledge of [Elohiym] rather than burnt offerings." (Hosea 6:6).
- "Has [YHWH] as great a delight in burnt offerings and sacrifices as in obeying the voice of the Lord? Behold, to obey is better than sacrifice, and to hearken more than the fat of rams." (1 Samuel 15:22)
- "With what shall I come to [YHWH], and bow myself before the [Elohiym] on high? Shall I come to Him with burnt offerings, with yearling calves? Does [YHWH] take delight in thousands of rams, in ten thousand rivers of oil? Shall I present my firstborn for my rebellious acts, the fruit of my body for the sin of my soul? He has told you, O man, what is good; and what does [YHWH] require of you but to do justice, to love kindness, and to walk humbly with your God" (Micah 6:6-8)

Answer for yourself: Do you now begin to see what the very wise king Solomon was trying to explain in 1 Kings 8, when he said that even though the Israelite people may not always have access to the sacrifices and the Priesthood, they would always have access to the Holy One of Israel?

Solomon, the wisest man who ever lived, understood that repentance and not blood is the Scriptural form of atonement.

Answer for yourself: Remember the story of Jonah?

He was sent to the evil city of Nineveh (non-Jews) to warn them of their impending destruction. Jonah does not come into the city and tell the people that unless they begin offering sacrifices they are doomed. He does not tell them that unless they accept on faith that the shed blood of Israel's Messiah will atone for their sins they are lost. No! He warns them to repent. Their response to his warnings is: they fast, pray, and turn from their evil.

Answer for yourself: What is YHVH's response to their repentance?

"When [Elohiym] saw their deeds that they turned from their wicked way, then [Elohiym] relented concerning the calamity which He had declared He would bring upon them, and He did not do it." (Jonah 3:10).

EVEN NEBUCHADNEZZAR IS TOLD HOW TO ATONE FOR HIS SINS....VERY INTERESTING....

"Therefore, O king, may my advice be pleasing to you: Redeem your sins by doing righteousness, and your iniquities by showing mercy to the poor." (Daniel 4:27).

THE POWER OF PRAYER FOR ATONEMENT

After the ten northern tribes split away from Judah, a civil war prevented most of Israel from Temple worship. The prophet Hosea addressed this situation and instructed the people accordingly:

"Return, O Israel, to [YHWH] your God, For you have stumbled because of your iniquity. **Take words with you** and return to [YHWH]. **Say to Him**, 'Take away all iniquity, and receive us graciously, for we will render as bullocks the offerings of our lips'." (Hosea 14:1-2)

We are able to approach our god directly with prayer, which is possible at all times and regardless of the size of our bank accounts; and He assures us that sincere prayer can achieve forgiveness for our sins:

- "Deliver me from blood-guiltiness, O [YHWH], the [Elohiym] of my salvation. And my tongue shall sing aloud of Your righteousness. O [YHWH], open my lips, and my mouth shall show forth Your praise. For You do not delight in burnt offerings. The sacrifices of [Elohiym] are a broken spirit, a broken and contrite heart. These, O [Elohiym], You will not despise." (Psalms 51:14-17)"
- "I will praise the name of [Elohiym] with a song, and will magnify Him with thanksgiving. This shall please [YHWH] better than an ox or bullock that has horns and hoofs." (Psalm 69:30-31)
- "For You, [YHWH], are good, and ready to forgive, and abundant in loving kindness to all who call upon You. Give ear, O [YHWH] to my prayer, and give heed to the voice of my supplications." (Psalm 86:5-6)
- "And listen to the supplications of Your servant and of Your people Israel, when they pray toward this place; hear from heaven Your dwelling place, hear and forgive." (II Chronicles 6:21)

The Holy Scriptures of Israel are very clear. Prayer, a humble attitude, and above all, sincere heartfelt repentance is what the Holy One of Israel requires of His people in order to atone for sins. No doubt He knew thousands of years in advance that there would come a time when some would wrongly rely on the blood of a deified human sacrifice to vicariously replace obedience to His laws. It is evident to anyone with eyes to see that a comparison between The Holy Scriptures of Israel and the Greek NT to 'Baal' will reveal two entirely different religions. One is dedicated to the One True ETERNAL of Israel; the other is dedicated to just another of many mythological savior gods of the Babylonian mysteries.

The time will come when Israel's true messiah will usher in an era of peace when all nations will believe in and seek to worship the one true Holy One of Israel of our fathers Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob. At that time, the proponents of Christianity will deeply repent of the day when they taught the beloved nation of Israel and the descendants of Abraham to break the first commandment and worship another besides the Holy One of Israel.

One more article left....



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



THOUGHTS ON THE DEATH OF JESUS AS RELATED TO THE SACRIFICIAL SYSTEM #8

Bet Emet stands for "truth" as the name implies; House of Truth. Such truth has been dug out of man-made traditions and anti-Semitic teachings held sacred by millions for almost 2 millennia. What I am going to do next is somewhat dangerous but I want you warn you ahead of time. I am going to make an assumption that I know is totally false for the purpose of teaching another truth which will shed even more light upon the truths of atonement.

LET'S ASSUME.....ALTHOUGH IT IS WRONG....JUST FOR A MINUTE.....

Let us assume that the traditional Christian teaching about Jesus' death being a sacrifice for atonement was true. So we approach what is said next with the erroneous assumption that that Jesus' death was for our sin. Now lets proceed.

ATONEMENT FOR BOTH TABLETS OF THE LAW OR ONLY FOR THE FIRST TABLET? THIS WILL SURPRISE YOU!

Answer for yourself: As a Christian, being told your whole life that Jesus' death was an atonement for your sin, then is this "atonement" as seen in his sacrifice (a type and shadow of sin offerings) an atonement for all kinds of sin?

Honestly, the answer is "NO" not all sin, because in the sacrifice of lambs, on Yom Kippur for instance, they only atoned for sins of the First Tablet of the Law and not the Second Tablet of the Law.

This is very important to recognize especially when one makes parallels to Jesus as a "type and shadow" of Old Testament truths regarding atonement. And few Christians have ever studied enough to know this....but the Jews did!

You can be a Christian you whole life and go to church your whole life and NEVER know that even when sacrifices were brought to the Temple that they not only ONLY atoned for unintentional sins....but also ONLY atoned for the sins of the First Tablet of the Law and not for ANY sins committed which were violations of the Second Tablet of the Law!

Answer for yourself: Even if Jesus' death was an atonement for sin, then if being truthful to the rule of "types and shadows" how is it possible that his death and shed blood atoned as the "Lamb of God" for sins that never were atoned for by any animal sacrifice?

THINK!

Knowing this, that Jesus is type and shadow of the Suffering Servant of God, instead of a representative of the "many" "Suffering Servants" of Israel as he really was, then you can see how a false security in focusing on the blood could, and does lead, others to think light of sin and compromise with sin much more than they should (not knowing that such sins of the Second Tablet of the Law are not handled by the sacrifices for atonement).

Answer for yourself: What? Is this news to you? Did your pastor ever tell you this? Mine never did!

Answer for yourself: Then how are we to get atonement for such things we do when we sin if sacrifices NEVER covered it before?

Answer for yourself: Did God give us a "way" for atonement for such sins and because as Christians and followers of Jesus in Christianity he we failed to understand the sacrificial system correctly and miss this important message?

Such knowledge comes only if you study the Sacrificial process in detail. If Christians trusting the blood for "everything" only knew that the atonement provided by the Suffering Servant Israel (as typified in Jesus) atoned only for the First Tablet of the Law they would most likely think twice before sinning, thus understanding they are not "under the blood" for all things, that their moral responsibility and fear of God is a requirement in being co-laborers with God in their own salvation. Now you should better understand the passage which says "work out YOUR salvation with fear and trembling

If we truly understand the Sacrificial system, and you should now if you have been reading these articles, then you know that Jesus, and the Suffering Servant of God (Israel) did not die for atonement for ALL SINS! Without this knowledge of sins atoned only for the First Tablet of the Law (sins between man toward God) we will not have a strong enough deterrent to avoid sinning sins involved in the Second Tablet of the Law...sins between man and man. Thus, understanding the Sacrificial system and the dynamics involved, the more correct interpretation would be "Christ died because of sins." And in this death of Yeshua as a paradigm of all of Israel [Suffering Servant] was efficacy for sins of the First Tablet of the Law ONLY and not the Second Tablet of the Law. The Second Tablet of the Law is atoned for by your repentance, confession, prayer, restitution, alms, etc., as Isaiah and other Prophets teach in the Hebrew Scriptures where were later altered by the Alexandrian Essenes and later Romans to exclude such concepts from the Hebrew Scriptures when translated into the Greek and Latin!

Let us not forget that Israel is a Holy Nation and a Royal Priesthood. A Priest's function is to make intercession for another and aid in another's reconciliation. As you saw earlier that prayer was one of the several forms of atonement, then this should renew your appreciation for the Jewish people who, on Yom Kippur, stand in the gap for the world in their prayer services. They literally, as Priests to YHVH, pray for the world and their sins that God would be merciful and forgive their sin. This is such a Holy thing which is not understood by Christians let alone Christian missionaries who are fixated on converting every Jew to Christianity?

Answer for yourself: If such a demonic and diabolical plan was ever to succeed, God forbid, then who would stand in the gap for the world on Yom Kippur.....Baptists, Catholics, Charismatics? Christianity does not ever recognize or observe the commanded Holy Days in the Bible.

ARE YOU GUILTY OF BREAKING THE SECOND TABLET OF THE

LAW.....AND NOT KNOWING IT?

So many might have read this article so far and say..."so what...I don't break the commands of the Second Tablet of the Law?"

Not so fast now.

Christians, because of their perverse theology, break them at will, and what is so devious, is that they do it without ever knowing. My purpose is not to offend anyone, but if I could be honest with you and God for a moment I want you to grasp this next sentence. When I graduated from Seminary I had learned a lot, but most was religious propaganda to support a particular denominational position. It was only after years of intense study following Seminary did I come to the knowledge of the truth that I had hoped to find there but didn't. And if I can say that then what is the level of understanding of the typical pew setter in the Churches who never reads books or studies his own faith in-depth?

If you were aware of what is contained in the Second Tablet of the Law you would be overwhelmed and I would hope, once realizing the magnitude of such violations of God's will by the typical Christian following "Christian doctrine" then your tears would run like rivers and your conduct change.

TAKE TITHING FOR EXAMPLE

This is a commandment between man and man, as the **Bible commands that the tithe be used for certain things only**. These "things" were always "people" in one way or another, for only if the giving of one's finances was to God and Godly pursuits would the Kingdom of Heaven be manifested on earth as it is in Heaven. God does not need our money; other do. For example the Tithe is commanded every 2 out of 6 years to be given wholly to the poor, the lame, blind, sick, infirm, widows, orphans, etc. Only to these needy people, make in the image of God, receive your blessings and care will they experience the love of God the way He intended. God intended their need be met; not miraculously from heaven, but by you!

Two years out of six you were commanded by God to "keep" your tithe and use it for "whatever your soul lusted after." Now, understand this was to be in a Godly pursuit. For example the celebration of the Sabbaths and the Seven Biblical Festivals. Also, you were commanded to share it with the poor as they again might experience in "earnest" the Kingdom of Heaven God had prepared for them. Notice it was you again who were to give to these people.

Lastly, two years out of six you were to give your tithe, and I paraphrase, to the choir, the janitors, and the levites. The levites basically are the choir. They also taught the people. They were NOT preachers but teachers. Notice also this is one of the gifts to the body as Paul states. Conspicuously absent from such a list of gifts is a "preacher." Understand if I am a good teacher, then you the student, become the proclaimer or the "preacher." That is how God intended it to work.

Now, the vast, vast majority of Christian Churches do not allocate their funds in the above manner as taught by the Holy Scriptures. Ask for our teachings on the Tithe and you can quickly see in detail of what I speak. This means that no matter how much you give to your church, if your spiritual authorities do not obey the Commandments of giving and appropriate your monies in areas not sanctioned by God in His Word then they have robbed from God no matter what Scriptures they read when they take up the offering. And you become an accomplice to stealing from God as you are accountable for His Word whether you know His Word or not. You will be judged by it.

Now as you can see, you can give to your Christian Church all day long and "feel" good about it, but you violate the Commands of God in doing so. Now understand you violate God Commandments of giving by so trusting your Church with your money.

Answer for yourself: If you have believed in Jesus' death for your sin, as if such "death" and "shed blood" does not and never did atone for violations of the Second Tablet of the Law....then you do realize you die in your sin and never know until you see God face to face?

Answer for yourself: You really have two problems. You didn't know well enough the Commandments about tithing to even questions what your Church is doing and you did not know well enough the Sacrificial System to know that some sins are never covered by it. Then do you realize that your erroneous understandings of such things as caused you to ignorantly continue to rob God and assure your rebuke when you meet up with Him since the work of Jesus you have been taught to "trust" in never applied in the first place?

Answer for yourself: Do you grasp the horrible consequences of such ignorance of the truths of God's Word and the sure fate that awaits you because Christianity has not studied hard enough to see the truth since blinded by anti-Semitism of the Church Fathers since the 2nd century?

Well if you tithe according to the manner of most Christian Churches today you not only rob from God but from those created in His image as well. If you continue to give to churches which don't obey the Laws and Commandments concerning tithing you are a partaker of their sins and there is no atonement for that sin for you when you die unless your repent now of such behavior! Sadly few Christians know what the Jewish Scriptures command regarding "how to tithe". Giving your tithe to the Christian Church where the elders fail to appropriate the correct percentages into the designated areas commanded by the Torah guarantees you that your rob God! While pastoring in Dallas as a Staff Pastor on staff of a mega church, the last two years I could no longer tithe to the church where I Pastored having learned the truth about the tithe. Contention was an understatement but when truth comes error must leave

Repentance toward that sin, a new obedience, a new conduct, and confession of that sin is our only methods of atonement and if not done, will ensure we enter into the World to Come with sins in those areas where atonement has not been proved.

PUTTING IT ALL TOGETHER

You have see that it a life, you life, that makes atonement for sin. Such repentance, confession, prayer, and new obedient conduct is the only reassurance that at-that-moment you are right with God. Being so, and having done so, then you have the right to be on the altar of God and you are ..in your heart. You need not bring an animal sacrifice for you and your life are already one! The animal, if you remember, was only a physical demonstration of the atonement you already have acquired by your actions. Such is the mercy of God to reveal to us, His people, how we can cleans ourselves.

The Gentile Christian Church, over the centuries, has stolen such truths from you and corrupted the truth and recorded it in their anti-Semitic document...the New Testament

There is no atonement for the sins of the Second Tablet of the Law unless you make it for yourself!

You now understand our lives, or our "souls", will be devoted to error instead of truth and our lives will not provide atonement unless we repent. But one must know the truth in order to repent or else he never knows he is wrong. That is why study is so important. This is only one small example.

After years of dedicated intense study I found that worshipping according to Christian teachings often is sin as the vast majority of Christianity today has changed the Sabbath as well as made obsolete the Holy Days and Festivals of God and there are commandments regarding Gentile

believers keeping them. Remember your poor tithe goes to these observances as well.

You might not be a murderer with a gun, but our word “kill” is equated by the Rabbis to mean gossip, slander, blasphemy, as well as the failure to take care of the poor, widows, and the orphans. The Rabbis group this with murder which again is sin of the Second Tablet of the Law.

Answer four yourself: Can you see how involved this can get and how important for the Christian who loves God to know and make adjustments with his life while he can?

"FAITH OF JESUS" OR "FAITH IN JESUS"

In discussion of these aspects of the Sacrificial system, we must never forget that we are called to accept the “faith of Jesus” and not just have “faith in Jesus.” In these articles I have presented the faith of Yeshua in light to his views on atonement. Yeshua believed the Tanakh (Law, Prophets, Writings). If we are to approximate holiness by living Christ-like that means we have to have a new understanding of how we are to live and we must become familiar with the Laws of God which regulate man’s conduct in life. **Only then will our lives, lived in conformity to the Laws of God, result in atonement.** At your death you will appreciate the atonement your life procured through your obedience and repentance when shown your lives and conduct are in error. Such Laws, statutes, and ordinances reveal to us, in 248 positive commandments, what God is and does, and in 365 negative commandments what God is not and what He does not do. Only in incorporating them into our lives can be assured that what we do and believe is correct. Only then can our lives [souls] be an atonement. Failure to measure our conduct as compared with these commandments only assures we live by our own understanding, and that cannot be trusted for our hearts, according to Jeremiah are desperately wicked and we cannot know them for sure. **Having this knowledge, the rest is up to you.** Shalom.



20%^{off} on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES
COUPON CODE: **NF20**



ISAIAH 53...THE TRUTH ABOUT THE PROPHECY YOUR CHURCH NEVER TAUGHT YOU

In these next pages and articles I have demonstrated beyond any doubt that the original and only logical interpretation of Isaiah 53 as *originally held* and *handed down* by the first readers and hearers of this passage was that the "suffering servant" referred to by Isaiah the prophet is the corporate nation of Israel and was never intended or understood by its first hearers to single out one particular individual apart from the corporate nation. As you read these articles you will see that for yourself. To approach this passage "an agenda" in order to read "Jesus/Yeshua" into the passages whereby you separate him out and apart from the corporate suffering of Israel is not exegesis and does great damage to the intended meaning of the passage as both God gave it and as Isaiah intended his readers to understand it when he gave it to them. Yet it is my firm belief that within the "corporate suffering" of Israel as the "Servant" of YHWH we find Yeshua as possibly the greatest example if not the greatest example of the proto-typical Jewish Servant, who unfortunately like most Jewish people through history, has suffered at the hands of non-Jews in their calling as a "light to the Gentiles". Yeshua is a perfect case in point, for only after his passion did a movement arise to take his message of hope and salvation to the non-Jewish nations of the world. I hope these pages help you better "rightly divide" the Word of Truth where by you come to see the big picture. Shalom.

- [#1 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#2 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#3 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#4 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#5 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#6 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#7 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [#8 WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ISAIAH 53](#)
- [DID THE JEWS ALWAYS INTERPRET ISAIAH'S SUFFERING SERVANT OF CHAPTERS 52 AND 52 AS THE "NATION"...OR DID RASHI CHANGE THIS INTERPRETATION AS CHRISTIANS SAY?](#)



bennoah1@airmail.net



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #1

As a Christian you hear others often speak about Isaiah 53 and make connection with Yeshua as if this passage was prophetic for Yeshua. In fact, often you may encounter questions from Jews who are involved in or considering Christianity. Among the questions, one chapter of our Jewish Scriptures keeps coming up: Isaiah 53.

Answer for yourself: Wasn't the Prophet, in fact, referring to Yeshua in this chapter?

Answer for yourself: And didn't all Jews before the Middle Ages recognize this chapter as "messianic"?

We at Bet Emet Ministries hope to assist you in interpreting a chapter which has become a cornerstone of Christian theology and the impetus for evangelism to Jews.

Answer for yourself: After reading these articles please answer for yourself: should Isaiah 53 be used in such a manner any longer by Christians? On with the study.

Jewish sages teach that "whoever saves a single Jewish soul is considered as if he had saved an entire world." How precious is the human soul! We hope that you too will value your soul highly enough to prayerfully ponder that which follows. G-D's truth is not always easy to discern, but we are possessors of a Divine promise; "you will find Him if you search after Him with all your heart and all your soul" (Deut. 4:29). As faithful child of God you know that it's worth the effort. And now - on with the search!

Before engaging in an examination of Isaiah 53 itself, some preliminary issues must be considered.

First is the issue of circular reasoning. Even if we interpret the chapter as most Christians do (forgetting for a minute the mistranslations and distortions of context which will be noted below in the following articles), the most that could be said is this: Isaiah 53 is about someone who dies for the sins of others.

Answer for yourself: People may have seen Yeshua die, but did anyone see him die as an atonement for the sins of others?

Of course not; this is simply the meaning which the New Testament gives to his death, and that only many years later as his followers try to explain his death in light of the failure of his return as prophesied by him and others earlier. Only if you already accept the New Testament teaching that his death had a non-visible, spiritual significance can you then go back to Isaiah and say, "see - the Prophet predicted what I already believe." Isaiah 53, then, is in reality no "proof" at all, but rather a contrived confirmation for someone who has already chosen

Christianity and chooses to read into the text what they wish regardless of what the Prophet intended to confer in his original message.

DID THE FOLLOWERS OF YESHUA AND OTHER JEWS OF THE TIME VIEW ISAIAH 53 AS A MESSIANIC PROPHECY?

Second (and consistent with all Jewish teaching at the time), Yeshua's' own disciples didn't view Isaiah 53 as a messianic prophecy. For example, after Peter identifies Yeshua as the Messiah (Matt. 16:16), he is informed that Yeshua will be killed (Matt. 16:21). His response: "G-D forbid it, lord! This shall never happen to you" (Matt. 16:22). See, also, Mk. 9:31-32; Mk. 16:10-11; Jn. 20:9. Evidently this was "news" to him and something that he was not aware of as an adult Jew which was most assuredly familiar with his own religion.

DID YESHUA VIEW ISAIAH 53 AS A MESSIANIC PROPHECY?

Even Yeshua didn't see Isaiah 53 as crucial to his messianic claims - why else did he call the Jews children of the devil for not believing in him before the alleged resurrection (Jn. 8:39-47)?

Answer for yourself: And why did he later request that G-D "remove this cup from me" (Mk. 14:36) - didn't he know that a "removal of the cup" would violate the Gentile understanding of Isaiah 53 which his church would come to realize later after his death?

Answer for yourself: And third, even if we accept the Gentile Christian interpretation of Isaiah 53, where is it indicated (either in Isaiah 53 or anywhere else in the Jewish Scriptures) that you must believe in this "Messiah" to get the benefits?

THE CONTEXT OF ISAIAH 53 IS COMPLETELY OVERLOOKED BY CHRISTIANS TODAY

Since any portion of Scripture is only understood properly when viewed in the context of G-D's revelation as a whole, some additional study will be helpful before you "tackle" Isaiah 53.

Look at the setting in which Isaiah 53 occurs. Earlier on in Isaiah, G-D had predicted exile and calamity for the Jewish people. Chapter 53, however, occurs in the midst of Isaiah's "Messages of Consolation", which tell of the restoration of Israel to a position of prominence and a vindication of their status as G-D's chosen people. In chapter 52, for example, Israel is described as "oppressed without cause" (v.4) and "taken away" (v.5), yet G-D promises a brighter future ahead, one in which Israel will again prosper and be redeemed in the sight of all the nations (v.1-3, 8-12).

Chapter 54 further elaborates upon the redemption which awaits the nation of Israel. Following immediately after chapter 53's promise of a reward for G-D's servant in return for all of its suffering (53:10-12), chapter 54 describes an unequivocally joyous fate for the Jewish people. Speaking clearly of the Jewish people and their exalted status (even according to all Christian commentaries), chapter 54 ends as follows: "'This is the heritage of the servants of the L-rd and their vindication is from Me,' declares the L-rd."

ISAIAH 53...A QUICK OVERVIEW BEFORE WE BEGIN

In the original Hebrew texts, there are no chapter divisions, and Jew and Christian alike agree that chapter 53 is actually a continuation of the prophecy which begins at 52:13. Accordingly, our analysis must begin at that verse.

52:13 "Behold, My servant will prosper." Israel in the singular is called G-D's servant throughout Isaiah, both explicitly (Isa. 41:8-9; 44:1-2; 45:4; 48:20; 49:3) and implicitly (Isa. 42:19-20; 43:10) - the Messiah is not.

This is of major importance for our study.

Other references to "Israel as G-D's servant" include Jer. 30:10 (note that in Jer. 30:17, the servant Israel is regarded by the nations as an outcast, forsaken by G-D, as in Isa. 53:4); Jer. 46:27-28; Ps. 136:22; Lk. 1:54. The "servant" is the nation of Israel and not one individual!

Answer for yourself: Given the Christian view that Yeshua is G-D, is G-D His own servant?

52:15 - 53:1 "So shall he (the servant) startle many nations, the kings will stand speechless; For that which had not been told them they shall see and that which they had not heard shall they ponder. Who would believe what we have heard?" Quite clearly, the nations and their kings will be amazed at what happens to the "servant of the L-rd," and they will say "who would believe what we have heard?". 52:15 tells us explicitly that it is the nations of the world, the gentiles, who are doing the talking in Isaiah 53. See, also, Micah 7:12-17, which speaks of the nations' astonishment when the Jewish people again blossom in the Messianic age.

53:1 "And to whom has the arm of the L-rd been revealed?" In Isaiah, and throughout our Scriptures, G-D's "arm" refers to the physical redemption of the Jewish people from the oppression of other nations (see, e.g., Isa. 52:8-12; Isa. 63:12; Deut. 4:34; Deut. 7:19; Ps. 44:3).

53:3 "Despised and rejected of men." While this is clearly applicable to Israel (see Isa. 60:15; Ps. 44:13-14), it cannot be reconciled with the New Testament account of Yeshua, a man who was supposedly "praised by all" (Lk. 4:14-15) and followed by multitudes (Matt. 4:25), who would later acclaim him as a prophet upon his triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Matt. 21:9-11). Even as he was taken to be crucified, a multitude bemoaned his fate (Lk. 23:27). Yeshua had to be taken by stealth, as the rulers feared "a riot of the people" (Mk. 14:1-2).

53:3 "A man of pains and acquainted with disease." Israel's adversities are frequently likened to sickness - see, e.g., Isa. 1:5-6; Jer. 10:19; Jer 30:12.

53:4 "Surely our diseases he carried and our pains he bore." In Matt. 8:17, this is correctly translated, and said to be literally (not spiritually) fulfilled in Yeshua's healing of the sick, a reading inconsistent with the Christian mistranslation of 53:4 itself.

53:4 "Yet we ourselves esteemed him stricken, smitten of G- D and afflicted." See Jer. 30:17 - of G-D's servant Israel (30:10), it is said by the nations, "It is Zion; no one cares for her."

53:5 "But he was wounded from (NOTE: not "for") our transgressions, he was crushed from (AGAIN: not "for") our iniquities." Whereas the Gentile nations had thought the Servant (Israel) was undergoing Divine retribution for its sins (53:4), they now realize that the Servant's sufferings stemmed from their OWN actions and sinfulness against the nation. This theme is further developed throughout our Jewish Scriptures - see, e.g., Jer. 50:7; Jer. 10:25. ALSO: Note that the Messiah "shall not fail nor be crushed till he has set the right in the earth" (Isa. 42:4). This is serious business, as you can see; when Messiah comes he will a major bone to pick with the Roman Church which spawned both anti-Semitic Catholicism and his child Protestantism.

53:7 "He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth. Like a lamb that is led to slaughter, and like a sheep that is silent before its shearers, so he did not open his mouth." Note that in the prior chapter (Isa. 52), Israel is said to have been oppressed and taken away without cause (52:4-5). A similar theme is developed in Psalm 44, wherein King David speaks of the corporate nation of Israel and her faithfulness even in the face of gentile oppression (44:17- 18) and describes Israel as "sheep to be slaughtered" in the midst of the unfaithful gentile nations (44:22,11).

Regarding the claim that Yeshua "did not open his mouth" when faced with oppression and affliction, see Matt. 27:46, Jn. 18:23, 36-37.

53:8 "From dominion and judgment he was taken away." Note the correct translation of the Hebrew. The Christians are forced to mistranslate, since - by Yeshua's own testimony - he never had any rights to rulership or judgment, at least not on the "first coming." See, e.g., Jn. 3:17; Jn. 8:15; Jn. 12:47; Jn. 18:36.

53:8 "He was cut off out of the land of the living."

53:9 "His grave was assigned with wicked men." See Ez. 37:11-14, wherein Israelis described as "cut off" and G-D promises to open its "graves" and bring Israel back into its own land. Other examples of figurative deaths include Ex. 10:17; 2 Sam. 9:8; 2 Sam. 16:9.

53:8 "From my peoples' sins, there was injury to them." Here the Prophet makes absolutely clear, to anyone familiar with Biblical Hebrew, that the oppressed Servant is a collective Servant, not a single individual. The Hebrew word "lamoh", when used in our Scriptures, always means "to them" never "to him" and may be found, for example, in Psalm 99:7 - "They kept his testimonies, and the statute that He gave to them."

53:9 "And with the rich in his deaths." Perhaps King James should have changed the original Hebrew, which again makes clear that we are dealing with a collective Servant, i.e., Israel, which will "come to life" when the exile ends (Ez. 37:14).

53:9 "He had done no violence." See Matt. 21:12; Mk. 11:15-16; Lk. 19:45; Lk. 19:27; Matt. 10:34 and Lk. 12:51; then judge for yourself whether this passage is truly consistent with the New Testament account of Yeshua.

53:10 "He shall see his seed." The Hebrew word for "seed", used in this verse, always refers to physical descendants in our Jewish Scriptures. See, e.g., Gen. 12:7; Gen. 15:13; Gen. 46:6; Ex. 28:43. A different word, generally translated as "sons", is used to refer to spiritual descendants (see Deut. 14:1, e.g.).

53:10 "He will prolong his days."

Answer for yourself: Not only did Yeshua die young, but how could the days be prolonged of someone who is alleged to be G-D?

53:11 "With his knowledge the righteous one, my Servant, will cause many to be just." Note again the correct translation: the Servant will cause many to be just, he will not "justify the many."

The Jewish mission is to serve as a "light to the nations" which will ultimately lead the world to a knowledge of the one true G-D, this both by example (Deut. 4:5-8; Zech. 8:23) and by instructing the nations in G-D's Law (Isa. 2:3-4; Micah 4:2-3). This mission, however, has been tragically circumvented by the Roman Church throughout history by the editing and adulterating the documents we call the New Testament today. What was once a Torah centered faith has become a religion based upon "believing in the identity of a man" instead of "living a life in obedience to the Law/Commandments of God." Today "grace" had completely nullified "personal accountability before God." Needless to say the "light" of Divine Truth as been replaced by Gentile Christianity's Catholic Church Council's decisions upon the "identity" of Yeshua as it evolved over the first 500 years of the church. The identity of the Servant of God, the Jewish People, who paid in their blood the price that I might know God today, has been completely obliterated by Christian theology whereby "one man" has replaced an entire nation.

53:12 "Therefore, I will divide a portion to him with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the mighty."

Answer for yourself: If Yeshua is G-D, does the idea of reward have any meaning?

Answer for yourself: Is it not rather the Jewish people - who righteously bore the sins of the world and yet remained faithful to G-D (Ps. 44) - who will be rewarded, and this in the manner described more fully in Isaiah chapters 52 and 54?

In the following articles in this series we will examine in depth many of the above items for your study and evaluation. When we finish you will no longer have any doubt or confusion regarding the correct interpretation of Isaiah 53 and whether it refers to Yeshua or not. Who Is The Servant of God? We address that next.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #2

ISAIAH'S USE OF SERVANT IN REFERENCE TO ISRAEL-THE NATION

In order to begin our study with the proper background it is important that you familiarize yourself with the following Scriptures and the meaning of the prophet Isaiah in writing them. The following are every mention of "servant" from Isaiah. 40-66. Please read and see if Isaiah is consistent throughout the book by describing *the nation of Israel as the servant and not a man.* This is of utmost important that we understand the context of the prophet Isaiah due to all the improper teaching we have heard during our lives that have preconditioned us to "read into the passage" meanings not ever intended by the Prophet Isaiah.

I ask that you take the time to read each of the chapters listed below in order for you to get the context. Then, and only then, can you be certain that the "servant" in question is not an individual man, but a collective of people: namely; the people of Israel which included Yeshua, but never was intended to reference him to the exclusion of the whole of the Jewish people.

Isa 41:8

8 But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend. (KJV)

Isa 41:9

9 Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away. (KJV)

Isa 42:1

1 Behold my servant, whom I uphold; mine elect, in whom my soul delighteth; I have put my spirit upon him: he shall bring forth judgment to the Gentiles. (KJV)

Isa 42:19

19 Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the LORD's servant? (KJV)

Isa 43:10

10 Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. (KJV)
[notice the explicit reference to the servant in both the singular and plural in the same verse]

Isa 44:1

1 Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant; and Israel, whom I have chosen: (KJV)

Isa 44:2

2 Thus saith the LORD that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee; Fear not, O Jacob, my servant; and thou, Jesurun, whom I have chosen. (KJV)

Isa 44:21

21 Remember these, O Jacob and Israel; for thou art my servant: I have formed thee; thou art my servant: O Israel, thou shalt not be forgotten of me. (KJV)

Isa 44:26

26 That confirmeth the word of his servant, and performeth the counsel of his messengers; that saith to Jerusalem, Thou shalt be inhabited; and to the cities of Judah, Ye shall be built, and I will raise up the decayed places thereof: (KJV)

Isa 48:20

20 Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth; say ye, The LORD hath redeemed his servant Jacob. (KJV)

Isa 49:3

3 And said unto me, Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified. (KJV)

Isa 49:5

5 And now, saith the LORD that formed me from the womb to be his servant, to bring Jacob again to him, Though Israel be not gathered, yet shall I be glorious in the eyes of the LORD, and my God shall be my strength. (KJV)

Isa 49:6

6 And he said, It is a light thing that thou shouldest be my servant to raise up the tribes of Jacob, and to restore the preserved of Israel: I will also give thee for a light to the Gentiles, that thou mayest be my salvation unto the end of the earth. (KJV)

Isa 50:10

10 Who is among you that feareth the LORD, that obeyeth the voice of his servant, that walketh in darkness, and hath no light? let him trust in the name of the LORD, and stay upon his God. (KJV)

Isa 52:13

13 Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high. (KJV)

Isa 53:11

11 He shall see of the travail of his soul, and shall be satisfied: by his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many; for he shall bear their iniquities. (KJV)

By now you should be able to see for yourself that the Prophet Isaiah intended the "nation of Israel" be understood as the Servant of YHVH, and it is this who is the "Suffering Servant" of Isaiah 53.

Now we continue.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #3

I suppose Isaiah 53 is possibly the most misunderstood and misused passages in the whole Bible. The reason as you will quickly come to see is partly due to the purposefully misquoting of the Jewish Masoretic text whereby the verses have been terribly altered. This not only destroys the original meaning intended by Isaiah but substitutes a "foreign" meaning instead.

Ever since I was a child I was told to believe that this passage refereed to Yeshua. Does it? You might be surprised when you study it in detail as I have. If you undertake to read these series of articles the results you will discover will reveal a completely different understanding from what many of you supposed that Isaiah, as recorded in your Christian Bibles, actually means. Besides the reason "highlighted" above, another reason why we did not understand this passage correctly as most of us grew up in the church is that our spiritual authorities chose to "read into the text" ideas that could not be "drawn from the text". Let me explain.

In Seminary I learned that there are laws of interpretation that must be applied to the text of scripture if one wanted to arrive at the truth of what the passage is saying. There is only one problem outside of the Seminary classroom; namely few pastors or church adhere to such rule and laws of interpretation of scripture. I learned that there is a big difference between "exegesis" and "eisegesis." Let me explain by looking at the definitions of these two very important words.

Exegesis, [from exegeomai in the Greek, to explain-ex, and hegeomai, to lead, to guide] The exposition or interpretation of any literary production, but more particularly the exposition or interpretation of Scripture; also the principles of the art of sacred interpretation; exegetics; hermeneutics.

Eisegesis noun : personal interpretation of a text (especially of the Bible) using your own ideas. In other words, reading into the text concepts and ideas totally foreign to the text.

As you can see for yourself if we follow the laws of eisegesis we can be assured of arriving at an erroneous interpretation of the text and lose the truths the prophet or writer intended to convey. Conversely, only by rigid application of the laws of exegesis can we be assured of arriving at the truths God desires we both understand and possess. Let us go on.

Since this article is intended for Christian readers, I will not go into depth regarding the traditional interpretation that the "Suffering Servant" has been taught to be Yeshua in the Isaiah 52 and especially the

Isaiah 53 passages by the Christian Church for centuries. I would only ask that you read these series of articles closely and limit your "eisegesis" (reading into the text your personal interpretation received through sermonizing) and let the truths of the passage derived from "exegesis (whereby we explain, interpret, and critically examine the text) speak to you and determine what your religious belief system should be in light of the facts as they are "taken from the passage" and not "read into" the passage. After you have completed these articles the decision will be up to you what you believe Isaiah 53 is teaching. But until you read these articles and see this information for yourself you are limited by the knowledge withheld from you and are sadly unable to make an intelligent decision. With this as my motive let us begin a critical examination of the text.

ISA 52:13---ISA 53:12...(AS TAKEN FROM THE MASORETIC TEXT [THE JEWISH BIBLE] AND NOT THE ALTERED OLD TESTAMENTS FROM MOST CHRISTIAN'S BIBLES (THE KJV FOR EXAMPLE)

13. Behold, My servant shall prosper; he shall be exalted and lifted up, and shall be very high.

14. As many wondered about you, "How marred his appearance is from that of a man, and his features from that of people!"

15. So shall he cast down many nations; kings shall shut their mouths because of him; for what had not been told to them they shall see; and that which they had not heard they shall consider.

Let me interject that the word for "nations" in the Hebrew is as follows:

1471 gowy rarely (shortened) goy- as a noun, masculine: nation, people

- a) nation, people
- 1) usually of non-Hebrew people
- 2) used of descendants of Abraham
- b) used of a swarm of locusts or other animals (figurative) as a proper noun, masculine:
- c) Goyim? = "nations"

Now back to the text....

1. Who bath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?
2. And he came up like a sapling before it, and like a root from dry ground, he had neither form nor comeliness; and we saw him that he had no appearance that we should have desired him.
3. Despised and forsaken by men, a man of pains and accustomed to illness: and as one who hides his face from us; despised, and we esteemed him not.
4. Indeed, he bore our illnesses, and our pains - he carried them, yet we accounted him as plagued, smitten by God and oppressed.
5. But he was pained from our transgressions, crushed from our iniquities; the chastisement of our welfare was upon him, and with his wound we were healed.
6. We all went astray like sheep, we have turned, each one on his own way, and the Lord accepted his prayers for the iniquity of all of us.
7. He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he would not open his mouth; like a lamb to the slaughter he would be brought, and like a sheep that is mute before her shearers, and he would not open his mouth.
8. From imprisonment and from judgment he is taken, and his generation who shall tell? For he was cut off from the land of the living; because of the transgression of my people, a plague befell them.
9. And he gave his grave to the wicked, and to the wealthy with his kinds of deaths, because he committed no violence, and there was no deceit in his mouth.

10. And the Lord wished to crush him, He made him ill; if his soul makes itself restitution, he shall see seed, he shall prolong his days, and God's purpose shall prosper in his hand.
11. From the toil of his soul he would see, he would be satisfied; with his knowledge My servant would vindicate the just for many, and their iniquities he would bear.
12. Therefore, I will allot him a portion in public, and with the strong he shall share plunder, because he poured out his soul to death, and with transgressors he was counted; and he bore the sin of many, and interceded for the transgressors.

WE MUST DECIDE WHO IS DOING THE “SPEAKING” IN THESE VERSES IN ORDER TO INTERPRET THEM CORRECTLY

Isaiah 52:15-53:

- Isa. 52:15. So shall he cast down many nations; the kings shall shut their mouths because of him; for that which had not been told to them they shall see; and that which they had not heard they shall consider.
- Isa. 53:1. Who hath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?

Notice first with me "certain" words. They are in the “plural.” Kings of nations (Gentile kings of non-Jewish nations) are speaking here in their numbed astonishment. For what they are finally witnessing is in stark contrast to everything they had ever heard and considered (or even heard preached about the Jews). Understandably, the first question on their lips is, "Who would have ever believed such a thing?" These Gentile leaders and “kings” are utterly astounded that the Jewish people, whom all the non-Jewish nations have together despised and molested, will be vindicated and enjoy the promised salvation of God. *This is totally foreign to their theologies and what they were accustomed to hear taught and preached and what they expected to happen to the Jewish people.* In other words these thoughts and beliefs about the fate of the Jewish people and their salvation have been totally in error as held by these non-Jewish people. Understand that the vast majority of Christianity today, if asked, will say the Jewish people are damned to hell if they don't believe in the Messiah or the blood of Yeshua. Let us go on.

The palpable shock that the gentile nations will experience and express at the end of days is a common theme throughout the Bible. But this fact can only be known if you spend a lot of time in the Hebrew Scriptures, and let's face the truth, most Christians today spend the vast majority of their time reading only the New Testament and find little use for the Jewish Scriptures.

Bear in mind that nowhere in scripture do the prophets foretell that the Jewish people will ever proclaim shock, or admit any mistake to the gentiles in the messianic age. On the contrary, the Bible clearly testifies that in the messianic age ten gentiles of different languages will grasp the shirt of a Jew and say, "Let us go with ,YOU, for we have heard that God is with ,YOU." (Zechariah 8:23)

Micah 7:15-16

15 According to the days of thy coming out of the land of Egypt will I show unto them marvelous things. 16 *The nations (non-Jewish peoples) shall see and be confounded at all of their might: they shall lay their hands upon their mouth, their ears shall be deaf.*

Isaiah 41:11

11 Behold all those who were incensed against you shall be ashamed and *confounded*; those who quarreled with you shall be as naught and be lost.

Jeremiah 16:19-20

19 O Lord, my strength, and my fortress, and my refuge in the day of affliction, the *Gentiles* shall come unto thee from the ends of the earth and shall say, "*Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no benefit.* 20 Shall a man make Gods unto himself, and they are no Gods?

Please listen. As a Seminary graduate with a Master's degree no less, the tools I received while at Seminary were put to further use after I graduated as I proceeded to be involved in in-depth study of Biblical language, Biblical history, culture, etc. I must admit that upon 15 years of in-depth research and study, sometimes up to 10 hours a day, I have found that I have fulfilled Jeremiah 16:19-20. I have come to the conclusion that Jeremiah is totally correct: my non-Jewish forefathers, having accepted the legacy of Nicea and Constantine, and others who replaced a Jewish faith with one of Rome, and who altered the manuscripts to make sure that all subsequent non-Jewish followers accept "their" brand of religion, propagated religious lies, vanity, and vain worship. Faced with such knowledge which most have not had the opportunity to be exposed to themselves, I endeavor to reach out to others to inform them of the truths long held from the Christian community in order that their knowledge and faith in both God and Messiah be correct and not after the traditions of men.

REGARDLESS OF WHAT YOU HAVE HEARD PREACHED IN YOUR CHURCH....WHO DOES ISAIAH IDENTIFY AS "THE SERVANT"?

Isaiah 41:8-9

But thou, *Israel*, art My servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham My friend. 9 Whom I grasped from the ends of the earth, and from it nobles I called you, and I said to you. "*You are My servant*"; I chose you and I did not despise you.

Isaiah 44:1-2

1 Yet hear now, O Jacob My servant and Israel, whom I have chosen. So said the Lord your Maker, and He who formed you from the womb shall aid you. 2 Fear not, My servant Israel, and Jeshurun whom I have chosen.

Isaiah 44:21

21 Remember these, O *Jacob and Israel*, for thou art My servant, I have formed thee; thou art My servant, O *Israel*, thou shalt not be forgotten of Me.

Isaiah 45:4

4 For the sake of *My servant Jacob*, and Israel My chosen one, and I called to you by your name...

Isaiah 48:20

20 Leave Babylon, flee from the Chaldeans; with a voice of singing declare, tell this, publicize it to the end of the earth; say, The Lord has redeemed *His servant Jacob*."

Isaiah 49:3

3 And said to me, *thou art My Servant*, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified!

Psalms 136:22

22 Even a heritage unto Israel His servant; for His mercy endures forever

Jeremiah 30:10

10 Therefore fear not, *O My Servant Jacob*, says the Lord, neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, behold, I will save you from afar....

Answer for yourself: So what do we learn about the identity of the “Servant” of God?

The Suffering Servant of God is the nation of Israel and not an individual; that is, the Suffering Servant of God is a collection of people and not just one person.

Answer for yourself: What are the implications of reading only “one” person into Isaiah 53 then?

Simply, we are guilty of not drawing out of the passage the intended meaning of the prophet (exegesis), but rather, misinterpreting the passage by "reading into" the passage a preconceived belief formed by what others have said (eisegesis) which cannot be supported by critical examination of the text. Our religious belief system is in error, and often this leads us to vain worship.

Answer for yourself: If we read “Yeshua” into Isaiah 53 and not understand that the “suffering servant” is the collective nation of Israel, then are we not guilty of “reading into the text our personal interpretation” irrespective of the intended meaning of the prophet and guilty of “eisegesis”? We sure are.

THE ONLY CONCLUSION WE CAN RIGHTFULLY DRAW FROM TRUTHFUL EXAMINATION OF THE TEXT IS THAT THE IDENTITY OF THE “SERVANT” IN THE PROPHET’S FOURTH SERVANT SONG, ISAIAH 53, MUST BE THE NATION OF ISRAEL AND NOT ONE INDIVIDUAL



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #4

In the previous article I made a strong case for correctly interpreting the “Suffering Servant” of Isaiah 53 in the plural and not the singular [the “servant” is the corporate nation..and not one individual].

That means if we want to correctly interpret the Bible we cannot any longer read “Jesus” into Isa. 53 no matter what our theology is at present. Let us now examine more concrete testimony which validates the interpretation of Isaiah 53 as referring to the nation of Israel and not just one man.

THROUGHOUT THE SERVANT SONGS THE “NATION OF ISRAEL” IS SPOKEN OF IN THE SINGULAR...BUT THE PRONOUN IS UNDERSTOOD AS THE "NATION"

As I grew up in the church I was continually told that since Isaiah 53's references to the Servant is in the singular that this conclusively proves that this chapter is speaking of a single individual rather than the entire nation of Israel.

To say that the “singular” reference, as applied to the Suffering Servant in Isaiah 53, definitely refers to Jesus disregards the entire context and surrounding poetic motif of Isaiah 53.

I cannot ask you to believe this unless I can prove it to you. So let us investigate the matter in detail.

In Isaiah 43:10, the prophet clearly identifies the "servant" (singular) as God's "witnesses" (plural).

Notice that the “servant” is plural thus referring to more than one individual. Also, all Christians agree that the two chapters that sandwich Isaiah 53 (52 and 54) consistently speak of the Jewish people as a single individual. When considering that "Isaiah 53" actually begins in the latter part of the 52nd chapter, Christianity's argument becomes increasingly weak. Furthermore, as I will show you momentarily, the prophet alternately speaks of the servant in Isaiah 53 in both the singular and plural.

As the book of Isaiah progresses into the 54th chapter, it continues to speak of the Jewish people as though they are a single individual. This barren woman, a picture of a tormented Israel, will be saved from her affliction and jubilate wholeheartedly in her final vindication.

Isaiah 43:10

10 Ye are *My witnesses* saith the Lord, and My *servant* whom I have chosen: that you may know and believe Me, and understand that I am He: before Me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after Me.

Notice how the plural “witnesses” refers to only “one servant” (singular).

Isaiah 52:1-2

1 Awaken, awaken, put on your strength, *O Zion*; put on the garments of your beauty, Jerusalem the Holy City, for no longer shall the uncircumcised or the unclean continue to enter you. 2 Shake yourselves from the dust, arise, sit down, O Jerusalem; free yourself of the bands of your neck, *O captive daughter of Zion*.

Isaiah 54:1

"Sing you *barren woman* who has not born, burst out into song and jubilate, you who have not experienced birth pangs, for the children of the desolate one are more than the children of the married woman," says the Lord.

DOES THE WRITER OF THE GOSPEL OF MATTHEW TAKE VERSES OUT OF CONTEXT TO CREATE HIS UNIQUE THEOLOGY? YES...HE DOES!

Matthew does to Hosea precisely what other Christians do to Isaiah. In Hosea 11:1, the prophet is referring to national Israel (plural) in the singular as God's son. The writer of the Gospel of Matthew 2:15 takes half the verse out of context, and quotes this verse as if it is speaking about the messiah (singular).

Similarly, the context of Isaiah 53 reveals that Isaiah is speaking of national Israel (many people) in the singular, yet I was led to believe that this chapter is speaking about Jesus. Such is not the case.

Hosea 11:1-2, 5

1 When Israel was a child, then I loved him, and out of Egypt I called my son (referring to a nation). 2 The more they called them, the more they went from them, they sacrificed unto the Baalim, and offered to graven images

5 He shall not return into the land of Egypt, but the Assyrian shall be his king, because they refused to return.

Again you can see that the prophet is referring to the nation of Israel (numbering in hundreds of thousands” in the singular with the use of “he” along with the plural use of “they.”

Exodus 4:22

22...thus saith the Lord, Israel is My son, My first born.

So you can see that the nation, numbering thousands and thousands, is referred to collectively in the singular. Thus the Suffering Servant, as revealed as the nation of Israel continues to be the collective people of Israel in

Isaiah 53 and to refer to Jesus alone is a grievous error of interpretation.

LET US NOT FORGET WHO IS SPEAKING IN ISAIAH 53...WHO IS?

As we prepare to delve into the text of Isaiah 53 we must at the beginning come to an accurate understanding of who is speaking. Without such an understanding we can be assured we will interpret the passages of Isaiah 53 incorrectly and thereby attribute meanings to them that the original author never intended.

Let me state right up front that the original manuscripts, even copies of manuscripts we have discovered, never had chapter divisions within them. These were added much later by the Church. So often we find chapter divisions put in the most unlikely of places. Sometimes the chapter division obscures the meaning of the text as well as who is doing the actual speaking as I will show you in Isaiah 53. Failure to notice who is speaking in Isaiah 53 is compounded by the chapter division which was artificially created centuries after the text was originally written. Search as you will, you will not discern the identity of the speaker by reading Isaiah 53 because the identity of the speaker is given in the verses above the chapter division of Isaiah 53. Failure to look to Isaiah 52 to discern the true speaker will cause you to believe that since Isaiah is the writer, he must be speaking himself and we erroneously connect such a concept in our minds to the idea that he is speaking for Israel. Nothing could be further from the truth. To this very important issue we now turn.

The following is taken from the Jewish Scriptures and the Tanakh [and not the corrupted Old Testaments in the Christian Bibles]

Isa 52:13-15

Indeed, My servant shall prosper. Be exalted and raised to great heights. 14 Just as the many were appalled at him So marred was his appearance, unlike of man, His for, beyond human semblance- 15 Just so he shall startle many nations. Kings shall be silenced because of him, For they shall see what has not been told them, Shall behold what they never heard.

Now notice the next verse...called Isaiah 53:1

“Who can believe what we have heard? Upon whom has the arm of the LORD been revealed?...

Answer for yourself: Did you notice anything different between the translation in the Tanakh and the KJV?

Well, the Tanakh makes note that Isaiah 53:1 is a quote from the Gentile kings and nations. What follows in Isa. 53 is the testimony of the Gentile Kings which represent the Gentile Nations. The Christian Bible, the KJV, does not make this as plain and we tend to think that Isaiah is speaking; thereby making the following testimony apply to the Jews when it refers to the non-Jewish world! This is very, very important!

One immediately notices, since put on the alert what to look for it, that the speaker is designated in Isaiah 52 just a few verses before Isaiah 53. The kings/rulers of the nations are engaged in a dialogue concerning the Jewish people. It is the Gentile kings of the nations which are speaking and not the Jewish people. For too long now Christians read Isaiah 53 without noticing in the latter part of Isaiah 52 that the speaker is not Isaiah or the Jewish people, but rather the Gentile nations. Failure to notice this guarantees misinterpretation of Isaiah 53!

Not only should we notice this, but in the Jewish translation given above we should take note of the quotations surrounding the verses which literally the Gentile kings are speaking. This further makes certain we

understand that the following dialogue is from a Gentile's perspective and not a Jewish perspective. This again is of paramount importance. The "incrimination" of the testimony that follows in Isaiah 53 is not the testimony of the Jews, but rather the testimony of the Gentiles of the world regarding the nation of Israel. Such quotations are absent in my KJV bible. The failure to note this helps one mistranslate Isaiah 53.

Bearing constantly in mind that the servant of God has, and will be shown to be corporate Israel, let us look at some passages in a KJV Christian Bible.

Isaiah 52:13-15

Behold, my servant shall deal prudently, he shall be exalted and extolled, and be very high.

As many were astonished at thee: his visage was so marred more than any man, and his form more than the sons of men:

So shall he sprinkle many nations ; the kings shall shut their mouths at him: for *that* which they had not been told them shall they see; and *that* which they had not heard shall they consider.

We are told that the nations of the world (non-Jewish nations) along with their kings/rulers will consider God's servant. We are told they are in line for revelation concerning God's servant (Israel). Understanding that the servant is again the Jewish people, the non-Jewish people and their authorities will come to an understanding concerning the Jewish people that they did not possess earlier. Their consideration of the Jewish people is enumerated for us beginning at Isaiah 53:1.

Isaiah 53:1

Who hath believed our report? And to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?

Remembering chapter divisions are artificial creations, if we read Isaiah 52:13-15 consecutively along with Isaiah 53:1 we see the beauty of the continuing story. The kings/rulers and Gentile nations will see what they had not previously seen and will hear what they had not previously heard. Understanding these Gentile kings and nations get revelation concerning the Jewish people we have their response to such new insights beginning in Isaiah 53:1. The KJV does not put this verse in quotes as noted earlier. The Jewish Scriptures does! Isaiah 53 needs to be understood as the Gentile response to new revelation as God lifts their blindness to see and understand the role of God's servant, Israel, through the ages. This new insight goes against what they had previously been told to believe. Such will probably be your response as well.

These Gentile kings are literally saying "who is going to believe this...who is going to believe what we now see in light of what we were taught as well as taught about the Jewish people?" These Gentile rulers and nations are literally saying "who else sees the truth considering the Jewish people to which we were once blinded but not see?" These Gentile kings and nations begin in Isaiah 53:2 to delineate the role of Israel as they now comprehend it in truth. This new enlightenment concerning Israel as the servant of God causes a massive repentance in both their perspective and religious belief system. These Kings of Gentile nations [in Isaiah 53] recount for us the tragic story of Israel and how she has been mistreated, persecuted, and rejected by the Gentile nations throughout history. These Gentiles admit their guilt. Line upon line of Isaiah 53 is the unfolding of the tragic truth concerning the barbarism of the Gentile nations toward their Jewish neighbors. Yet the role God gave Israel never changed. She was faithful to be a light to the non-Jewish nations. With this understanding, all of Isaiah 53 must be re-read, for if we fail to remember who is speaking verse after verse, which is easy to do because of our past erroneous teachings, we will miss entirely what God

wished we see through the eyes and pen of the Prophet Isaiah.

CHRISTIANITY WILL HAVE TO FINALLY ADMIT THEY WERE WRONG...ABOUT THE JEWS AND ABOUT THEIR "THEOLOGY"

Notice that the surprised kings of nations will witness the final vindication and salvation of Israel irrespective of what they thought or believed about the Jews previously. That means our narrow theology as Christians, and that of our religious leaders regarding the salvation of the Jewish people will one day crumble in the light of God's truth which will finally be forced upon the non-Jewish nations by Divine intervention and the ultimate salvation of Israel. Woe to men like the early anti-Semitic church fathers, and men like Luther and Calvin which helped shape theology today which denies the people of Israel their place in God's plan of salvation of the world.

With that understanding let us continue noticing who is speaking in these verses.

Isaiah 53:1

1. Who hath believed our (non-Jewish nations) report, and to whom is the arm of the Lord revealed?

The common anthropomorphic reference to the arm of the Lord throughout scripture signifies the spiritual and military salvation of the Jewish people from the gentile nations.

Answer for yourself: Did you hear that? This is salvation from gentile nations and gentile theology!

Israel's final vindication and redemption in the eyes of the world's nations is the central theme of the last 27 chapters of the book of Isaiah (40-66).

Notice in the following verses the theme in Isaiah 52 which "sandwiched" between Isaiah 53 and Isaiah 54.

Isaiah 52:9-12

9 Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem: for the Lord hath comforted His people, He hath redeemed Jerusalem. 10 *The Lord hath made bare His Holy Arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God!* 11 Turn away, turn away, get out of there, touch no unclean one; get out of its midst, purify yourselves, you who bear the Lord's vessels. 12 For not with haste shall you go forth and not in a flurry of flight shall you go, for the Lord goes before you, and your rear guard is the God of Israel-

Isaiah 54:7-10

7 "For a small moment have I forsaken you, and with great mercy will I gather you. 8 With a little wrath did I hide My countenance for a moment from you, *and with everlasting kindness will I have compassion on you,*" said your redeemer, the Lord. 9 "For this is to Me [as] the waters of Noah, as I swore that the waters of Noah shall never pass over the earth, so have I sworn neither to be wroth with you nor to rebuke you. 10 *For the mountains shall depart and the hills totter, but My kindness shall not depart from you, neither shall the covenant of My peace totter,*" says the Lord, Who has compassion on you.

So you see that throughout the chapters that surround Isaiah 53, the prophet

is speaking of the salvation of the afflicted Jewish nation in the presence of their persecutors, the gentile nations with their anti-Semitic hatred for the Jewish people.

Deuteronomy 7:19

19 The great miracles that you saw with your own eyes - the signs, the wonders, the *mighty hand and the outstretched arm* with which God brought you out of Egypt.

Again, the subject is the nation and not an individual. Thus the astonishment of the Gentile rulers and kings, including the religious rulers among the Gentiles, when God supernaturally intervenes and saves the nation of Israel despite what the Gentiles have taught theologically about the Jewish people.

THROUGHOUT THEIR PERILOUS EXILE, ISRAEL (THE NATION AND NOT JUST ONE PERSON) STRUGGLED AS A YOUNG TREE GROWING ON A PARCHED LAND

Isaiah 53:2

2 And he (the nation and not an individual) came up like a sapling before it, and like a root from dry ground, he had neither form nor comeliness; and we saw him that he had no appearance that we should have desired him.

Now you are beginning to see that this does not refer to Yeshua, but the Jewish people in total. Just be honest with yourself for a moment.

Answer for yourself: Does Christianity today desire to learn from the Jewish people?

Answer for yourself: Does Christianity today desire to keep the Jewish Sabbath which is different from their own which can be shown to be a creation of Rome in reaction to the Jewish Sabbath?

Answer for yourself: Does Christianity today desire to keep the Biblical Festivals or does it have its own Roman calendar filled with pagan holidays to which Yeshua's name has been added?

Let it not be misunderstood that for the most part, non-Jewish Christianity today views the nation of Israel, God's Suffering Servant, and sees little within it that they desire.

Hosea 14:6-8

6 I will be as the dew unto Israel: he shall grow as the lily, and cast forth his roots as Lebanon. 7 His branches shall spread, and his beauty shall be as the olive tree, and his smell as Lebanon. 8 They that dwell under his shadow shall return; they shall revive as the corn, and grow as the vine: the scent thereof shall be as the wine of Lebanon.

Again further proof that the nation of Israel [corporate] is described in the singular [see above the "his" and its connection with "Israel"]. But also notice this, those who allow the branches of Israel to spread whereby they dwell under Israel's shadow shall return.

Answer for yourself: Return to what?

The true faith of God where we are truly grafted into Israel and correctly understand the Hebrew Scriptures.

Answer for yourself: Why do we as former Christians need to return to the faith once given to the saints?

Simply...

Jeremiah 16:19-20

19 O Lord, my strength, and my fortress, and my refuge in the day of affliction, the *Gentiles* shall come unto thee from the ends of the earth and shall say, "Surely our fathers have inherited lies, vanity, and things wherein there is no benefit. 20 Shall a man make Gods unto himself, and they are no Gods?

One such lie is that Isaiah refers to Yeshua as God's only Suffering Servant in Isaiah 53. Hopefully by now God is opening your eyes to the beauty of the Jewish people and their Torah and the wonderful role they play and always have played at God's true Suffering Servant.

Let us continue.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #5

In our previous articles we have demonstrated that the Suffering Servant in Isaiah is to be understood as the collective peoples of Israel and not just one person. Thus to say that Isaiah 53 refers to Yeshua is to misinterpret the intended meaning of the prophet Isaiah.

As we continue along we noticed that the Gentile rulers, both political and spiritual will be utterly amazed as the events in the future when God intervenes and saves the Jewish people in spite of what Christianity has taught about the Jewish people.

We again showed that pronouns used in Isaiah 52, 53, and 54, normally in the singular, in reality does not refer to Yeshua but again to the collective nation of Israel.

Now in this article we will deal with common misconceptions and misinterpretations of Isaiah 53 which erroneously have been applied to Yeshua, when again if we correctly interpret the passage, refers to the corporate nation once again.

THE NATIONS OF THE WORLD DESPISED, ABANDONED, AND AFFLICTED ISRAEL...NOT ONE PERSON [JESUS]

Isaiah 53:3

3 Despised and forsaken by men, a man of pains and accustomed to illness: and as one who hides his face from us; despised, and we esteemed him not.

Answer for yourself: With the understanding brought by the previous two articles, can you begin to see that the singular “man” and “him” must refer collectively to the nation of Israel as shown in the previous two documents?

Answer for yourself: Can you now better understand why I began the first article with stressing the differences between eisegesis and exegesis (reading into the text something not there or allowing the texts and context surrounding the Biblical text to define its meaning)? I hope so.

ISAIAH 49

The 49th chapter of Isaiah stands out as one of the most stirring sections of the Bible, and continues to set the stage for Isaiah 53. Its verses contain a moving conversation between Israel and God. As in all the Servant Songs, Isaiah repeatedly refers to nation of Israel in the singular.

Throughout this chapter the Jewish remnant cries out to God; the nation feels forsaken, afflicted, and abandoned. These passages do not refer to Yeshua (one person) and his passion but the Jewish peoples of all ages. These are the very same descriptions of torment that the Servant endures in Isaiah 53.

In response to their agony, the Almighty reassures His distressed nation that His love for His people even exceeds the intense affection a new mother feels for her hurting infant. As in Isaiah 53, the final vindication and salvation of the Jewish people is the chapter's central theme.

Isaiah 49:3, 7-8, 13-15

3 And said to me, **thou art My servant, O Israel** in whom I will be glorified!

7 For so said the Lord, the redeemer of Israel, his Holy One, *about him who is despised of men*, about him whom the nation abhors, about a slave of rulers, **"Kings (understood as nations) shall see and rise, princes, and they shall prostrate themselves,** for the sake of the Lord Who is faithful, the Holy One of Israel, and He chose **you (understood as the nation and not one person).**" 8 So said the Lord, "In a time of favor I answered you, and on a day of salvation I helped you; and I will watch you, and I will make you for a **people of a covenant,** to establish a land, to cause to inherit the desolate heritages. 13 Sing, O heavens, and rejoice, O earth, and mountains burst out in song, for the Lord has consoled His people, and He shall have mercy on His afflicted. 14 But Zion said, "The Lord has **forsaken me,** and the Lord has **forgotten me.**" 15 Shall a woman forget her suckling child, from having mercy on the child of her womb? These too shall forget, **but I will not forget you (again referring to the nation).**

Isaiah 54:4-7, 11, 14, 17

4 Fear not, for you shall not be ashamed, and not embarrassed, for you shall not be put to shame; for the shame of your youth you shall forget, and for the **humiliation** of your widowhood you shall no longer be remembered. 5 Nor your maker is your husband; the Lord Hosts is His name, and your redeemer the Holy One of Israel shall be called the God of all the earth. 6 For like a wife who **is forsaken and afflicted** in spirit has the Lord called you, and a wife of one's youth who was **rejected**, said your God. 7 For a small moment have **I forsaken you,** and with great mercy will I gather you.

11 **O thou afflicted,** who was not consoled, behold I will lay thy stones with fair colors, and lay thy foundations with sapphires.

14 With righteousness shall you be established, for you will be far from oppression, for you will not fear; and from ruin, for it will not come near you.

17 No weapon that is formed against you will prosper, and any tongue that rises against you in judgement, you shall condemn; this is the heritage of the **servants of the Lord** and their righteousness is from Me, says the Lord.

Understandably, one's familiarity with the chapters that precede and follow Isaiah 53 will determine the conclusions individuals come to regarding this crucial scriptural text. Those who are only familiar with this chapter (Isa 53) often wonder how anyone can conclude that Isaiah is speaking of anyone else but Yeshua. On the other hand, those who read Isaiah 53 in context, with its surrounding chapters as its backdrop, have difficulty understanding how anyone can honestly conclude that Isaiah 53 is speaking of anything else but the nation of Israel.

Isaiah 60:14-15

14 The sons of them (Gentiles) that afflicted you shall come bending unto you; and all they that despised you shall bow themselves down at the soles of your feet; and they shall call you, the city of the Lord, Zion of the Holy One of Israel. 15 Whereas you have been forsaken and despised, with no passerby, I will make you an everlasting pride, the joy of every generation.

Isaiah 40:2

2 Speak to the heart of Jerusalem and call to her, for she has become full from her host, for her iniquity has been appeased, for she has taken from the hand of the Lord double for all her sins (from the Gentiles).

Zechariah 1:15

15 And I am very angry with the nations that are at ease, for I was wroth a little, and they helped to do harm.

Isaiah 52:4-5

4 For so said the Lord God, "My people first went down to Egypt to sojourn there, but Assyria oppressed him without cause. 5 And now, what have I here," says the Lord, "that My people have been taken for nothing, *his* rulers boast," says the Lord, "and constantly all day My name is blasphemed."

Isaiah 62:2-4, 12

2 And the Gentiles shall see your righteousness, and all kings your glory, and you shall be called a new name, which the mouth of the Lord shall pronounce. 3 And you shall be a crown of glory in the hand of the Lord and a Kingly crown on the land of your God. 4 No longer shall "Forsaken" be said of you, and "Desolate" shall no longer be said of your land, for you shall be called "My desire is in her," and your land, "Inhabited," for the Lord desires you, and your land shall be inhabited.

12 And they shall call them the holy people, those redeemed by the Lord, and you shall be called, "Sought, a city not forsaken."

These above passages, some before Isaiah 53, and some afterwards, all show one thing. The Gentile nations of the world despised, abandoned, and afflicted God's Servant. All passages have one thing in common as well....namely; that those who were called "desolate, forsaken, afflicted, humiliated, despised, etc., refer to the collective people of Israel and cannot be applied as if referring to one man...namely Yeshua.

HAS THE TRANSLATION OF ISAIAH 52 IN YOUR CHRISTIAN BIBLE BEEN ALTERED FROM WHAT IT ORIGINALLY READ IN THE HEBREW MANUSCRIPTS FROM WHICH IT WAS TRANSLATED? YEP!

It is sad to say, but attempts of many Gentile Christians over the ages, in order to change the original messages of the Hebrew prophets, have altered the text of your Bible and its translation to create their own theology. This is every evident to the "informed believer." You can investigate this for yourself not only below in this website when we deal with the alteration of the "Messianic prophecies" in the Christian's Bibles, but at the following

websites:

<http://geocities.com/faithofyeshua>

<http://faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>

<http://bennoah1.freewebsites.com>

Let us investigate on a smaller scale in this article.

It was shocking for me to finally admit that many Christian Bible translators have altered the texts of the Christian's Bible for ulterior motives and goals. It occurs way more often than you could imagine. For example, Isaiah 52 was altered by Christian translators because this chapter is crucial as it serves as an indictment against the Christianization of Isaiah 53. The close relationship between Isaiah 52 and 53 is outstanding because the theme, poetic structure and motif of Isaiah 53 closely mimics the illustrative language of Isaiah 52. In addition, the chapter break between Isaiah 52 and 53 is completely artificial. If Isaiah 52 is translated correctly, it is difficult to ignore the parallelism between these two chapters. Corresponding to Isaiah 53, Isaiah 52 clearly identifies Israel in the singular, suffering innocently as a result of the destructive arrogance and spiritual recklessness of the gentile nations as well as Gentile Christianity.

The (KJV) King James Version of the Bible and the (NIV) New International Version translators were certainly concerned about how Bible readers would accept the notion that Isaiah 53 is referring to Yeshua, when Isaiah 52 so clearly describes the corporate nation of Israel as a single individual, innocently suffering as a result of the iniquity and sinful behavior of the nations of the world.

Answer for yourself: How did Christianity deal with this when printing their own Bibles..the Bibles like you most likely carry?

Get ready! Unscrupulous Christian translators, in effort to preserve their theology over truth, reconstructed crucial parts of the first half of Isaiah 52 so as not to resemble Isaiah 53's theme and poetic language.

For example, in Isaiah 52:4 the prophet recounts that "Assyria oppressed him [Israel the corporate nation as again spoken of in the singular] **without a cause**" As I have already attested, this concept that the nation of Israel innocently suffering as a single individual in Isaiah 52 is precisely the underlying theme of Isaiah 53.

Again, in Isaiah 52:4 the prophet speaks of the Jewish people in the singular as does Isaiah 53. Thus the NIV altered the text by removing the most offensive words of this verse. The NIV therefore reads: "lately, Assyria has oppressed them." The crucial words "without cause" have been removed.

Again, and even more important, the KJV as well as the NIV change the singular pronoun "him" in this verse to "them."

Answer for yourself: Why would they change the Hebrew "him" into "them" in Isaiah 52:4?

Answer for yourself: Again, can you begin to see that we who owned Christian Bibles were set up in hopes when we read Isaiah we might not make the connection that the singular pronoun "him," as used in such close proximity in Isaiah 52 where it means the corporate nation of Israel, would carry over in our thoughts when we read Isaiah 53?

In Isaiah 52:5 the Hebrew word "moshlov" means "his rulers," referring to the nation of Israel's rulers. The nation of Israel once again is spoken of in the singular. Therefore, the KJV and NIV translators again

change the singular pronoun “his” into the plural “them.”

Isaiah 52:4 in Hebrew

Assyria oppressed **him** without cause

Isaiah 52:4 in the KJV

the Assyrian oppressed **them** without cause

Isaiah 52:4 in the NIV

lately, Assyria has oppressed **them**

Answer for yourself: Do you see for yourself the efforts expended in changing the Word of God so as to destroy your ability to connect the singular pronouns of Isaiah 53 with corporate Israel?

Isaiah 52:5 in Hebrew

his rulers boast

Isaiah 52:5 in the KJV

they that rule over **them** make them howl

Isaiah 52:5 in the NIV

and those who rule **them** mock

Answer for yourself: Can you again see such lengths taken (changing “his” [singular] to “them [plural] by Christian Bible translators to change the Holy Word of God in order that you will accept their interpretation (that Isaiah 53 refers to Yeshua instead of Israel) instead of what God originally intended the texts to teach?

Answer for yourself: Can you begin to see how such drastic steps were taken as altering, adding, and deleting from the Word of God in order to make sure that when you read Isaiah 52 you don't interpret the Suffering Servant as the nation of Israel?

The KJV therefore reads, “rule over them.” The irony of all this Bible-tampering is that these Christian translators changed the singular reference to Israel in Isaiah 52 into the plural and the plural references in Isaiah 53 into the singular. All this was done in the name of religion. Such is the strength of anti-Semitism masquerading in religion.

Answer for yourself: So how come as Christians we don't know this when we read our Christian Bibles?

The answer is quite simple. When we bought a Bible we went to a Christian Book Store and bought what we were told and believed to be the infallible written Word of God. But as I have shown you, unless you compare the Old Testament writing in your Christian Bible with the Jewish Scriptures from the Jewish Publication House and their Hebrew Bible, we cannot know if there are errors or changes in our Christian Bibles that led us astray from the intended meaning of the text when first given by God.

Answer for yourself: How many of you can actually say that when you go to church you compare every passage quoted in the New Testament from the Hebrew Scriptures with the original Jewish Scriptures?

Answer for yourself: Before now, were you aware that such alterations, additions, and deletions occurred in your Christian Bibles?

Answer for yourself: Can we be confident that when reading from a Christian Bible that the passage we are reading in the Old Testament is accurately translated from the Hebraic original? No! The examples given in this article is but the tip of the iceberg!

Let us continue.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT IN THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #6

- In our previous three articles we have demonstrated that the Suffering Servant in Isaiah is to be understood as the collective peoples of Israel and not just one person. Thus to say that Isaiah 53 refers to Jesus is to misinterpret the intended meaning of the prophet Isaiah.
- As we continue along we noticed that the Gentile rulers and nations of the world despised, abandoned, and afflicted Israel. We noticed that the imagery as well as the pronouns used by the prophet in Isaiah 52 through 54 applied to the nation of Israel and not to only one man. We noticed that although Christianity does not interpret Isaiah 53 correctly today, that both the world political and spiritual leaders will one day be utterly amazed at the events in the future when God intervenes and saves the Jewish people in spite of what Christianity has taught about the Jewish people.
- We showed repeatedly that pronouns used in Isaiah 52, 53, and 54, normally in the singular, in reality does not refer to Jesus but to the collective nation of Israel.

Now in this article we will continue to deal with common misconceptions and misinterpretations of Isaiah 53 which erroneously have been applied to Jesus which rightfully apply to the nation. We will discover that it was not Jesus who suffered as a result of the iniquity of the world, but that the nation of Israel suffered as the result of the sins of the Gentile nations. We will also examine if it was Jesus who interceded for the world or if it was the nation of Israel. Lastly we will examine if Jesus was the sacrifice Isaiah 53 was speaking about, or if the remnant of Israel was the one massacred like sheep for the slaughter.

ONE DAY CHRISTIANITY AND ALL GENTILE WORLD LEADERS WILL REALIZE THAT THE NATION OF ISRAEL AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE SUFFERED AS A RESULT OF THEIR SINS

To make sure we don't lose focus of who is speaking in Isaiah 53 let me ask again this simple question which was already asked.

Answer for yourself: Let us ask once again...who is speaking? The Gentile political and spiritual leaders of the world

Isaiah 53:4-5

4 Indeed, he [corporate nation of Israel] bore our illnesses, and our pains - he [corporate nation of Israel] carried them, yet we accounted him [the corporate nation of Israel] as plagued, smitten by God and oppressed.

5. But he [corporate nation of Israel] was pained because of our transgressions, crushed because of our iniquities; the chastisement of our welfare was upon him [the corporate nation of Israel], and with his [the corporate nation of Israel] wounds we were healed.

Answer for yourself: Most likely your whole life you have been told that Isaiah 53, when it said “he bore our illnesses” and “was smitten by God and oppressed,” was referring to Jesus. Now what do you think since reading the past three articles?

Answer for yourself: When Isaiah [as shown repeatedly before in the first three articles when he repeatedly uses singular pronouns to refer to the corporation nation of Israel], refers to God’s Suffering Servant as the singular nation of Israel, whose identity are we now to think of [Jesus or Israel] when we see the prophet saying “he was wounded because of our transgressions, crushed because of our iniquities; the chastisement of our welfare was upon him, and with his wounds we were healed”?

"ARE" HEALED OR "WERE" HEALED?

In order to stress the ongoing and ever-current atonement of Jesus, Christian Bibles incorrectly translate “with his wounds we are healed,” in the present tense. Actually, the nations are speaking here of Israel’s past suffering, therefore the verse correctly reads “we were healed.”

Ezekiel 36:6-9, 15

6 Therefore, prophesy about the land of Israel and say to the mountains and to the hills, to the streams and to the valleys: Thus says my Lord, God: Behold! In My jealousy and in My anger I have spoken, because the shame of the nations you have borne. 7 Therefore, thus says my Lord, God: I have lifted My hand in an oath. Surely the nations which surround you - they will bear their shame. 8 But you, O mountains of Israel - you shall shoot forth your branches and bear your fruit for My people Israel, when they are about to come. 9 For behold! I am for you, and I shall turn to you; then you shall be tilled and sown.

15 And I shall no longer cause the ridicule of nations to be heard about you, and the shame of the nations you shall no longer bear, of your nations you shall never again be bereaved - the word of my Lord, God.

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that there is a time limit for Israel carrying the iniquity of the nations?

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that there is a time limit where Israel will no longer atone for the sins of the world?

Jeremiah 30:8-13

8 And it shall be on that day, says the Lord of hosts, (that) I will *break his yoke off your neck*, and I will break your thongs, and strangers shall no longer enslave them [the nation of Israel]. 9 And they shall serve the Lord their God and David their king, whom I will set up for them. 10 And you [servant nation], fear not, My servant Jacob, says the Lord, and do not be dismayed, O Israel, for behold I save you from afar and your seed from the land of their captivity, and Jacob shall again be silent and at ease, and no one will frighten them. 11 For I am with you, says the Lord, to save you, for I will make an end of all the nations where I dispersed you, but of you I will not make an end, but I will chasten you in measure, and I will not completely destroy you. 12 For so said the Lord: Your bruise [the nation's bruse] is painful, your wound [nations's wound] grievous.

13 No one deems your wound [nation's wound] to be healed, you have no healing medicines.

As you can readily see the evil manner in which the Gentile nations, as well as Christianity over the centuries, have treated the Jewish people have contributed to the sufferings of Israel. Such sufferings at the hands of Gentiles and Gentile nations is described in Isaiah 53:4-5(my paraphrase)..."Israel bore the pains inflicted upon them by the Gentile nations who misunderstood them, and such suffering was incorrectly interpreted by the oppressors as if Israel had been forsaken by God. Because of the Gentiles' sins against Israel the peoples of God were crushed, and the Gentiles thought they were doing God a favor by persecuting and killing the Jewish people."

IN SPITE OF SUCH CRUEL TREATMENT BY THE GENTILE NATIONS OF THE WORLD...ISRAEL PRAYED FOR THEIR OPPRESSORS

Remembering what we have already learned...that singular pronouns in the Servant Songs of Isaiah refer to the nation of Israel and not to only one person like Jesus, we find the following verses even the more astonishing.

Isaiah 53:6

6 We all went astray like sheep, we have turned, each one on his own way, and the Lord accepted his [the corporate nation of Israel] prayers for the iniquity of all of us.

Jeremiah 29:7

7 And seek the peace of the city where I have exiled you [nation of Israel] and pray for it to the Lord, for in its peace you shall have peace.

Now let us never again under estimate the importance of the prayer service in the Jewish synagogues of the world for by it atonement came for Gentile sins.

THE REMNANT OF ISRAEL HAS BEEN MASSACRED LIKE SHEEP FOR THE SLAUGHTER

Answer for yourself: Are we not led to believe, according to Christianity that Jesus as Messiah was rejected by the people of Israel and ultimately killed by them? Sure are.

Although the Bible explicitly and repeatedly describes the Jewish people [Suffering Servant as corporate Israel] as afflicted and despised by the Gentile nations, there is not even one clear reference to the Messiah as afflicted or despised anywhere in all of the Jewish Scriptures.

In light of what we have discovered about singular pronouns referring to corporate Israel, it is easy to see that it was the nation of Israel again which was afflicted. Just a brief overview of anti-Semitism from the annals of Church history is enough to make you sick. Notice the references below which describe the Jewish nation as afflicted by the Gentile nations.

Isaiah 53:7

7 He was oppressed, and he was afflicted, yet he would not open his mouth; like a lamb to the slaughter he would be brought, and like a sheep that is mute before her shearers, and he would not open his mouth.

Psalm 18:28

29 For you will save the **afflicted nation**; and you will bring down haughty looks.

Psalm 44 describes the plight of the righteous remnant of Israel. Notice how the language used here to describe the condition of the Jewish people parallels that of Isaiah 53.

Psalm 44:12, 14-15, 22

12 You have **delivered us like sheep for the slaughter**, and among the gentiles you have scattered us.

14 You made us a **disgrace to our neighbors, the mockery and scorn** of those around us. 15 You made us a byword among the **nations [Gentile nations]** to shake their heads.

22 Because for Your sake we are **killed all day long**, we are considered **as sheep for the slaughter**.

Ezekiel 34:15-15

15 I will tend **My sheep**, and lay them down-the words of my Lord, God. 16 The lost, I will seek out; and the banished, I will retrieve; **the wounded**, I will heal, and the frail, I will strengthen. But the fat one and the strong one, I will destroy. I will shepherd them with justice.

Zechariah 11:4-5, 7

4 So Said the Lord, my God: Tend the **flock of the slaughter**, 5 whose buyers shall lay them and not be guilty; and whose sellers shall say, "Blessed be the Lord, for I have become wealthy"; and whose shepherds shall not have pity on them.

7 And I tended the **flock of slaughter**, indeed, the poor of the flock.

THE GENTILE NATIONS ACKNOWLEDGE THAT AS A RESULT OF THEIR INIQUITY TOWARD THE JEWS (THEIR BOTHERS) THAT ISRAEL SUFFERED

Isaiah 53:8 [REMEMBER THE GENTILE KINGS REPRESENTING THE GENTILE NATIONS IS DOING THE SPEAKING IN THESE VERSES]

8 From imprisonment and from judgment he is taken, and his generation who shall tell? For he was cut off from the land of the living; **because of the transgression of my people, a plague befell them**.

Answer for yourself: Who is again speaking in Isaiah 53? The rulers and kings of the Gentile nations.

Answer for yourself: Whose transgressions? The Gentile nations toward the Jewish people!

Answer for yourself: Can you see for yourself that one day the Gentiles will face up to what they have done to

the Jewish people and how they have sinned against them and altered their Jewish Scriptures?

Answer for yourself: To whom did a plague fall? The Jewish people. The nation of Israel who happens to be the subject of the Servant Songs of Isaiah.

The prophet's use of the word (lamo) "them" as a pronoun for the Suffering Servant presents a monumental problem for Christian Bible translators committed to making Jesus fit the Servant of Isaiah 53. Poetically, the prophets often speak of the Jewish nation in the singular to accentuate the nation's distinctive corporate destiny. The prophets, however, never speak of an individual in the plural. Therefore, the use of the Hebrew word (lamo) "them", for the Servant of Isaiah 53, reveals that the Servant is NOT a single individual.

The KJV, and NIV and other Christian Bibles solve this problem by mistranslating the word "them" as "him" in the singular.

Since discovering that the Hebrew Scriptures correctly render "lamo" as "them," then let us look at how the Christian Bible does great injustice to the text by purposely mistranslating the verse to fit their erroneously theology. They change "them" to "him"!

In each of the examples following the Jewish Scriptures translate the word as "them" but our Christian translations have "him" instead....why?

Isaiah 53:8b KJV

for the transgressions of my people was he stricken

Isaiah 53:8b Modern Readers Bible

for the transgression of my people was he stricken

Isaiah 53:8b NIV

for the transgression of my people he was stricken

Isaiah 53:8b Living Bible

it was their sins that he was dying for - that he was suffering their punishment

Nowhere in these above examples was the pronoun intended to be rendered in the singular as "he," rather, the correct interpretation is the plural as "them." Who changed the Jewish Scriptures and why?

If we fail to realize who is speaking in Isaiah 53, then it is easy to see why Christians try to make this death spoken of in Isaiah 53 atone for the sins of the Jewish people, when in reality it is the death of the righteous remnant of Israel [corporate nation] which was due to the result of the sins of the Gentile nations.

But you see, if somehow you make Isaiah 53 to refer to Jesus [by failing to understand who is doing the speaking in Isaiah 53 and who is making a confession of "guilt" toward the Jewish people as well as changing the pronouns "them" to "him"] which I repeatedly have shown you occurred...then and only then can you make a case for Jesus being the "subject" of Isaiah 53.

Dear ones...tampering with the Holy Word of God to make our "theology" fit is a sin and brings God's anger because of us changing His Word [you shall not add or take away...remember?!]

WE SEE THAT CHRISTIAN BIBLE TRANSLATORS CHANGED THE HEBREW WORD “LAMO” WHICH MEANT “THEM” TO THE SINGULAR “HE” IN ISAIAH 53 BECAUSE OF THEIR THEOLOGY...DID THEY DO THE SAME ELSEWHERE?....NO...SO WHY IN ISAIAH 53?

Well the answer is simple....it did not serve their "theological" purpose to not do so!

Deuteronomy 32:35 (King James)

32...for the day of their calamity is at hand, and the things that shall come upon them make haste.

Deuteronomy 33:2 (King James)

2 ...He shined forth from Mount Paran, and he came with ten thousands of saints: From His right hand went a fiery law for them

Job 6:19 (King James)

19 The troops of Tema looked, the companies of Sheba waited for them

Job 14:21 (King James)

2 His sons come to honor, and he knoweth it not; and they are brought low, but he perceiveth it not of them

Job 24:17 (King James)

17 For the morning is to them even as the shadow of death: if one know them...

Psalms 2:4 (King James)

4 He that sitteth in the heavens shall laugh: the Lord shall have them in derision.

Psalms 44:4 (King James, 44:3)

4 For they got not the land in possession by their own sword, neither did their own arm save them

Psalms 119:165 (King James)

165 Great peace have they which love Thy law: and nothing shall offend them

Isaiah 16:4 (King James)

4 Let Mine outcasts dwell with thee, Moab, be thou a covert to them from the face of the spoiler: for the extortioner is at an end, the spoiler ceaseth, the oppressors are consumed out of the land.

Isaiah 23:1 (King James)

1 The burden of Tyre. Howl, ye ships of Tarshish, for it is laid waste, so that there is no house, no entering in: from the land of Chinim it is revealed to them

Isaiah 44:7 (King James)

7 And who, as I, shall call, and shall declare it, and set it in order for Me, since I appointed the ancient people? And the things that are coming, and shall come, let them show unto them

Isaiah 48:21 (King James)

21 And they thirsted not when he led them through the deserts: He caused waters to flow out of the rock for them: He calve the rock also, and the waters gushed out.

Lamentations 1:19 (King James)

19 I called for my lovers, but they deceived me: my priests and mine elders gave up the ghost in the city, while they sought their meat to relieve their souls.

Habakkuk 2:7 (King James)

7 Shall they not rise up suddenly that shall bite thee, and awake that shall vex thee, and thou shalt be for booties unto them?

I find it amazing that the same Bible translators who changed the meaning of the Hebrew pronoun for “them” to “he” in Isaiah 53 in order to read into the text the identity of Jesus [individual instead of a corporate nation] instead of the correct meaning of the nation of Israel which the prophet intended, did not follow their own laws of interpretation elsewhere when confronted with the same word. For in the examples given above, they saw no need whatsoever to change the plural “them” to “he” as they did in Isaiah.

Answer for yourself: How reliable are our Christian Bibles when those we trust to accurately translate the Scriptures are changing the very tense of the words to match their pre-formed theologies? Could our beliefs concering Jesus as connected with Isa. 53 be wrong as Christians?

Answer for yourself: If the Christian Gentile Bible translators had not wished to read into Isaiah 53 the identity of Jesus, do you think they would have felt the need to change the tense of the pronoun from “them” to “he” in Isaiah 53?

The bottom line for all Christians to understand is that we have heard way too much preached about Jesus and far too little studied from the texts of the Jewish Bible which tell us exactly and accurately what he believed as well as his original mission. If we had studied the original sources available to us, we would not be so mixed up theologically in Christianity today which boasts over 2000 different denominations all maintaining they have the truth about Jesus while at the same time being the most violent and crime ridden nation in the world. May God forgive our laziness to let others tell us what to believe instead of us studying to show ourselves approved unto God.

We continue.



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



WHAT YOU WERE NEVER TAUGHT BY YOUR CHRISTIAN CHURCH...THE TRUTH ABOUT ABOUT ISAIAH 53 #8

CRITICAL EXAMINATION OF VERSES FROM ISAIAH 53

As I grew up in church as a child, and even as a young adult, I was assured repeatedly by my spiritual leadership in our church that Isaiah chapter 53 referred to Yeshua. It seems that this one chapter from the Jewish Scriptures kept coming up in church regularly for discussion. In sermon after sermon, I heard that the Prophet Isaiah was referring to Yeshua in this chapter and that Yeshua “fulfilled” Isaiah chapter 53. I heard over and over that Yeshua is the “suffering servant” of Isaiah chapter 53. In fact I was told that I was to use this particular chapter in witnessing to unbelievers. I was even told that all Jews before the Middle Ages recognized this chapter as "messianic," but due to the efforts of a Rabbi Rashi that belief changed. In fact that is what Jews for Jesus claim and publish in their literature. There is only one problem with what Jews for Jesus teach regarding this and other thing; it is a lie and it can be proven so by reading the ancients. We will look at that later in a concluding article on this subject on this website. I suppose if you have an "organization" you can say what you will and people will believe you. Christendom has done that for centuries.

I can remember also being told when I was young that the moon was made out of cheese. Seriously, I was willing to accept all these above statements as fact without a personal inquiry on my part to see if these things be so. After many years of Bible study and research I realize that such beliefs attached to Isaiah 53 were in error, and most likely, you have made the same mistake. Later in life I did examine Isaiah 53 in detail for myself as well as the whole book of Isaiah [from the Jewish texts and not just from my Christian sources], and the results I found are the subject of this article. We at Bet Emet Ministries would like to share with you our research in hopes of assisting you in coming to the correct interpretation of a chapter which has become the cornerstone of Christianity let alone evangelism to the Jewish people. Please understand that if what we were told about Jesus and Isaiah 53 cannot stand the test of critical inquiry, then the very foundation of Christianity is rocked and maybe, oh maybe, the Jewish people and scholars have been right all along. Well, get ready, for if you will truly will bow your knee to truth then your legs will have bent before this article is over.

LET EVERY MAN BE A LIAR BUT LET G-D'S WORD BE TRUE!

Answer for yourself: Do you ascribe to the above phrase?

The Jewish sages teach that "whoever saves a single soul is considered as if he had saved an entire world." How

precious is the soul! Though the Bible study which you have begun and yet follows is a lengthy one, we have prepared it realizing that the subject matter is of a very sensitive nature, and that most will not take kindly to someone tampering with their religious belief system, let alone showing them that the very core of it is totally incorrect. We at Bet Emet hope that you too will value your soul highly enough to prayerfully ponder that which follows. G-D's truth is not always easy to discern, but we are possessors of a Divine promise; "you will find Him if you search after Him with all your heart and all your soul" (Deut. 4:29). As faithful Jews have attested for over 3500 years, it's worth the effort. And now - on with the search!

PRELIMINARY ISSUES INVOLVED IN CORRECTLY INTERPRETING ISAIAH 53

Before continuing our examination of Isaiah 53 itself, some preliminary issues must be considered. First is the issue of **circular reasoning**. Even if we interpret the chapter as most Christians do (forgetting for a minute the mistranslations and distortions of context which you have already seen and will continue to be noted below), the most that could be said is this: Isaiah 53 is about someone who dies both "because of" and "for" the sins of others. Right in the beginning I have to pose for you a very big question.

Answer for yourself: Understanding that the people were familiar with their own Bibles, then when Jesus died, did the people perceive he was dying for their sins?

Answer for yourself: Did the people who watched Jesus die understand his death as fulfilling Isaiah 53, or was this interpretation of his death conceived later by the Gentile Church, and read backward into the accounts of his death?

Answer for yourself: If Jesus' death was the "final sacrifice" for sins according to the Hebrew writer, then why does James instruct Paul to fulfill a nazirite vow in Acts 21 fully knowing that to do he has to bring blood sacrifices for sin offerings and atonement? Did you know that? Maybe you should put together Numbers chapter 6 and Acts 21 and see what the "picture" tells you. Those who crafted the New Testament and its replacement theology should have done a better job ridding themselves of such incriminating facts. Granted such knowledge is beneath the context of Acts 21 but it is there if study and "think."

Answer for yourself: For a moment do you think James would have instructed Paul to do that if he, the spirit-filled leader of Jesus' church, thought or knew for example that Jesus' death was some form of atonement of that Jesus was the long-awaited fulfillment of Isa. 53?

Answer for yourself: Would you have done the same (bring blood sacrifices for atonement) with such a faith "in Jesus" for your sin? I think not!

Answer for yourself: People may have seen Jesus die, but did anyone see him die as an atonement for the sins of others? James and the first church sure did not because this "vow" was 25 years after Jesus' death.

Answer for yourself: Don't you think that within 25 years or so the Holy Spirit would have told James and the mother church the "facts" about Jesus' death [that he was the fulfillment of Isa. 53] as we have come to be instructed if it were "true?"

These are some of the biggest questions you will ever have to answer for yourself. If we are to believe, as we have been taught in the Christian Church, that Isaiah 53 was speaking of the Messiah who was to die for the sins of others, then Jesus' followers, knowing this passage and longing for its fulfillment one day, should **not** been shocked at the idea of himself going to his death. But they were!

Answer for yourself: Is it possible that James and the mother church did not believe what we are taught about Jesus and Isa. 53 in our Christian Churches today?

The answer is simply they did not for 2 reasons:

- **First...their Jewish Scriptures (in Isaiah 53 and elsewhere) did not read like our corrupted translations today in our Christian Old Testaments so they would not have believed such things about "anyone" let alone Jesus.**
- **Second...their actions, based upon their beliefs, show they did not believe Isa. 53 referred to Jesus as some form of final atonement.**

Acts 21 reveals they did not (when you put that with Numbers 6 where sin offerings and atonements are connected with the nazirite vow that Paul took). The problem is not only the two-faced Paul who performs a "righteous act" that contradicts what he had been teaching but that James, Jesus' hand-picked leader, commands it to be done. Evidently James did not believe like Christians today. Who was right? It is pretty simple when you see the corruptions of the Jewish Bible that we have already exposed previously in these articles on Isa. 53 along with what yet follows.

Answer for yourself: How do we reconcile the supposed Christian's expectation of the Messiah's death for sin against the shock of the followers of Jesus at the announcements of his soon coming death?

Answer for yourself: Would they have not been looking forward for such redemption if that was the promise of the Prophets?

Answer for yourself: Since when is "atonement" connected with the Passover and not with Yom Kippur?

Answer for yourself: Can you find for yourself where atonement for sin is connected to a Passover Lamb" in the Jewish Scriptures? Its not! Many animals were sacrificed as offerings at all times of the year as well as when different situations came up in one's life. But not all of the animals sacrificed carried the idea of "atonement."**This may be a shock to you but "atonement" was never, I said never, connected with the death of the lamb at Passover. This should make you wonder about the "types and shadows" we have always connected to the life of Jesus.**

Answer for yourself: If Jesus is the Lamb of God, and understanding that the Passover lamb of Israel never atoned for the sins of the people, then how do we make the connection of atonement with the death of Jesus?

We cannot make such a connection between atonement for sin and the Passover regardless that the writers of the New Testament ascribe such a concept to his death as if Isaiah had taught the same thing. Isaiah did not and you are seeing that for yourself! If you have studied with us for a while you have seen for yourself that the original followers and apostles of Jesus had little if anything to do with the writings of the Gospels. Their names were "officially" attached to the anonymous writings by the Church in the fourth century. The first "quote" that names a Gospel by name is found not earlier than 200 A.D.

Answer for yourself: How can that be? Again it is simple. The names of the apostles were later attached to these documents which can easily be shown to have been written by non-Jewish writers much later than supposed by the Church.

Only if you already accept the New Testament teachings, and the corrupted Old Testament passages in your Christian translations, and only if you have been brainwashed since childhood to believe such "things" about Jesus can you accept the current theology of Jesus and his connection to Isa. 53. Any truthful analysis of the Jewish Scriptures and the Jewish Bible (the Old Testament Massoretic text) will reveal that such beliefs about Jesus are misplaced at best. In order to believe that Jesus' death had a non-visible, spiritual significance, you must use your Christian translation and "read into the passage" what you have been conditioned to believe from false preaching since you were a child. Only then can you approach your corrupted Christian Old Testaments and the corrupted book of Isaiah within it and say: "see - the Prophet predicted what I already believe." Isaiah

53, in the Christian Bible then, is in reality no "proof" at all, but rather a set-up intended to deceive the reader. It works well because I fell prey to such beliefs until I began a serious study of the manuscript evidences that make up our Bibles. I found it by accident. But God's leading is no accident. The real test comes in the courage necessary to teach the truth once you find it. Isaiah 53 in the Christian's Bible is little more (in selected places) than a contrived confirmation for someone who has already chosen Christianity and accepted what they have only heard over and over which they never checked out for themselves to see if "these things be so." I have and they are not what they appear in the Christian's Isaiah in is Bible.

WHY WAS THE MESSIAH'S DEATH - AS ATONEMENT OF SIN - NOT KNOWN BY THE JEWS WHO FOLLOWED JESUS?

Consistent with all Jewish teaching at the time, Yeshua's own Jewish disciples didn't view Isaiah 53 as a messianic prophecy. "Not so" you say. Well, it is quite understandable that the followers of Jesus were well versed with their own Jewish Scriptures. Just a cursory study of the manners and customs of the Jewish people reveal that at 5 year old the Jewish child had his first book of the Bible memorized (Leviticus). I said "memorized." To think that the Jewish people would not be conversant with their own Prophets is absolutely ludicrous. But that is what the New Testament writers would have us believe. What comes next might shock you so you may need to set down.

For example, after Peter identifies Jesus as the Messiah (Matt. 16:16), he is informed that Jesus will be killed (Matt. 16:21). His response is not "thank God...for we are dead in trespasses and sins and without your sacrifice for our sins we are lost." No not at all. He says rather remarkably: "G-D forbid it, lord! This shall never happen to you" (Matt. 16:22). This passage is very alarming and very telling in its scope.

Answer for yourself: Why was this idea of a dying Messiah of such news to Peter? It sure seems to be!

Answer for yourself: Had he forgotten the message of Isaiah 53 which every child knew, or is our Christian concept of a suffering servant being "Jesus," which we have been fed all our lives, really not contained in Isaiah 53?

Mark 9:31-32

- 31 For he taught his disciples, and said unto them, The Son of man is delivered into the hands of men, and they shall kill him; and after that he is killed, he shall rise the third day.
- 32 But they understood not that saying, and were afraid to ask him. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Do you find it rather hard to believe that in the first century, with Messianic fervor raging everywhere, that the followers of a presumed Messiah would not understand their own Scriptures, especially those referring to the Messiah who would be killed and resurrected?

Answer for yourself: How could the followers of a presumed Messiah have overlooked something as important in their Scriptures as the death of the coming Messiah?

Mark 16:10-11

- 10 And she went and told them that had been with him, as they mourned and wept.
- 11 And they, when they had heard that he was alive, and had been seen of her, believed not. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Do you find it rather hard to believe that in the first century, with Messianic fervor raging everywhere, that the followers of a presumed Messiah (remember they had already called him the "Christ") would have expressed non-belief at the report of Yeshua's resurrection if they had believed, according to their

Scriptures, that the Messiah was to die according to the Prophets and be resurrected in the first place?

John 20:9

9 For as yet they knew not the scripture, that he must rise again from the dead. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Do you find it rather hard to believe that in the first century, with Messianic fervor raging everywhere, that the followers of a presumed Messiah would not know their own scriptures? The reason they did not is again simple; such a Scripture in the Jewish Bible does not exist!

Answer for yourself: If it was common knowledge that Isaiah 53 had spoken of a Messiah who was to die for the sins of people as their atonement, then why was this news to Peter and why would he try and prevent such a wonderful thing?

Answer for yourself: Could it be that they did not hold the same beliefs about Isaiah 53 as we have attributed to them as Christians?

Answer for yourself: Do you want to know why they didn't hold the same beliefs about Isaiah 53 as we were taught, and could they have been correct and us wrong [especially in light that I have shown you how our translations of Isa. 53 have been forged on purpose and added to on purpose to create an artificial theology about Jesus]?

EVEN JESUS DIDN'T KNOW OF A DYING MESSIAH EITHER!

Even Jesus didn't see Isaiah 53 as crucial to his messianic claims.

Answer for yourself: Why did Jesus request that G-D "remove this cup from me" (Mk. 14:36) - didn't he know that a "removal of the cup" [escape an atoning death long awaited for by Israel and the world] would violate the future Christian-Gentile understanding of Isaiah 53?

Answer for yourself: Even if we accept the gentile Christian interpretation of Isaiah 53, where is it indicated (either in Isaiah 53 or anywhere else in our Jewish Scriptures) that you must believe in this "Messiah" to be "saved" or be in right-standing with God His Father? It is nowhere to be found!,

CONTEXT OF ISAIAH 40-66 EXAMINED...BACK TO THE TEXTS

Since any portion of Scripture is only understood properly when viewed in the context of G-D's revelation as a whole, some additional study will be helpful before you "tackle" Isaiah 53.

Look at the setting in which Isaiah 53 occurs. Earlier on in Isaiah, G-D had predicted exile and calamity for the nation and the Jewish people. Chapter 53, however, occurs in the midst of Isaiah's "Messages of Consolation", which tell of the restoration of the nation of Israel to a position of prominence and a vindication of their status as G-D's chosen people. In chapter 52, for example, the nation of Israel is described as "oppressed without cause" (v.4) and "taken away" (v.5), yet G-D promises a brighter future ahead, one in which the nation of Israel will again prosper and be redeemed in the sight of all the nations (v.1-3, 8-12).

Chapter 54 further elaborates upon the redemption which awaits the nation of Israel. Following immediately after chapter 53's promise of a reward for G-D's servant in return for all of its suffering (53:10-12), chapter 54 describes an unequivocally joyous fate for the Jewish people. Speaking clearly of the Jewish people and their exalted status (even according to all Christian commentaries), chapter 54 ends as follows: "'This is the heritage of the servants of the L-rd and their vindication is from Me,' declares the L-rd."

What I hope you noticed is that previously to Isaiah 53 [Isaiah 52], and afterward [Isaiah 54], the

subject of the discourse is still the “people of Israel,” the “nation of Israel” and not an individual.

What I hope you also noticed is that following chapter 53 Isaiah is still speaking of the “people” of Israel and not an individual. The context and subject of Isaiah 53 is the same as it has been since Isaiah 40... namely; the corporate nation and the people of Israel. The subject is “plural” and not singular! What throws a lot of people off is that from chapter 40 onward the writer used both “singular” and “plural” pronouns to refer to the “plural” nation of Israel, and used them interchangeably. If one misses this use of pronouns in relationship to the subject of Isaiah 40-66, then his whole interpretation of Isaiah, let alone Isaiah 53, will be in error! If one is not familiar with the subject and context of Isaiah 40 through 66, it is easy to see a passage where a singular pronoun (“he” for example) is used and mistakenly think that the author is speaking of only one person, when previously he has set a precedent of referring to the nation in the singular by describing them as a “he”. This is where most make their mistakes in interpreting Isaiah 53.

ISAIAH’S SERVANT - LOOKING AT THE EVIDENCE THAT IT IS THE NATION AND NOT A PERSON

In the original Hebrew texts, there are no chapter divisions, and Jew and Christian alike agree that chapter 53 is actually a continuation of the prophecy which begins at 52:13. Accordingly, our analysis must begin at that verse.

52:13 "Behold, My servant will prosper." Israel in the singular (notice that the nation is referred to in the “singular”) is called G-D's servant throughout Isaiah (the nation “plural” is called the “singular” servant), both explicitly (Isa. 41:8-9; 44:1-2; 45:4; 48:20; 49:3) and implicitly (Isa. 42:19-20; 43:10) - the Messiah is not.

Isa 41:8-9

- **8 But thou, Israel, art my servant, Jacob whom I have chosen, the seed of Abraham my friend.**
- **9 Thou whom I have taken from the ends of the earth, and called thee from the chief men thereof, and said unto thee, Thou art my servant; I have chosen thee, and not cast thee away. (KJV)**

Isa 44:1-2

- **1 Yet now hear, O Jacob my servant; and Israel, whom I have chosen:**
- **2 Thus saith the LORD that made thee, and formed thee from the womb, which will help thee; Fear not, O Jacob, my servant; and thou, Jesurun, whom I have chosen. (KJV)**

Isa 45:4

4 For Jacob my servant's sake, and Israel mine elect, I have even called thee by thy name: I have surnamed thee, though thou hast not known me. (KJV)

Isa 48:20

20 Go ye forth of Babylon, flee ye from the Chaldeans, with a voice of singing declare ye, tell this, utter it even to the end of the earth; say ye, The LORD hath redeemed his servant Jacob. (KJV)

Isa 49:3

3 And said unto me, Thou art my servant, O Israel, in whom I will be glorified. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Can you see for yourself that in every instance the “servant” (used in the singular) refers

to the corporate nation of Israel numbering millions and does not pertain to just one person (Jesus)?

Isa 42:19-20

19 Who is blind, but my servant? or deaf, as my messenger that I sent? who is blind as he that is perfect, and blind as the LORD's servant?

20 Seeing many things, but thou observest not; opening the ears, but he heareth not. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Understanding the traditional teaching of Christianity considering Jesus as the Suffering Servant, are you about to say that the above passage from Isaiah 42:19-20 referring to a non-hearing, non-observing, and non-obedient Servant refers to Jesus?

Isa 43:10

10 Ye are my witnesses, saith the LORD, and my servant whom I have chosen: that ye may know and believe me, and understand that I am he: before me there was no God formed, neither shall there be after me. (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Can you see for yourself from the Isa. 43:10 passage that the plural “witnesses” (referring to the nation of Israel, in the plural) is referred to in the singular as “my servant” as before?

Without a doubt the “servant” (used in the singular) refers to the corporate nation of Israel numbering millions, and it is this same meaning which should be rendered when reading Isaiah 53!

Other references to Israel as G-D's servant include Jer. 30:10 (note that in Jer. 30:17, the servant Israel is regarded by the nations as an outcast, forsaken by G-D, as in Isa. 53:4); Jer. 46:27-28; Ps. 136:22; Lk. 1:54.

Jer 30:10

10 Therefore fear thou not, O my servant Jacob, saith the LORD; neither be dismayed, O Israel: for, lo, I will save thee from afar, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and shall be in rest, and be quiet, and none shall make him afraid. (KJV)

Jer 46:27-28

- 27 But fear not thou, O my servant Jacob, and be not dismayed, O Israel: for, behold, I will save thee from afar off, and thy seed from the land of their captivity; and Jacob shall return, and be in rest and at ease, and none shall make him afraid.
- 28 Fear thou not, O Jacob my servant, saith the LORD: for I am with thee; for I will make a full end of all the nations whither I have driven thee: but I will not make a full end of thee, but correct thee in measure; yet will I not leave thee wholly unpunished. (KJV)

Ps 136:22

22 Even an heritage unto Israel his servant: for his mercy endureth for ever. (KJV)

Luke 1:54

54 He hath helped his servant Israel, in remembrance of his mercy; (KJV)

Answer for yourself: Also, given the Christian view that Jesus is G-D as well as the Suffering Servant, in Jeremiah 30:10 is G-D saving Himself?

Answer for yourself: Understanding the traditional Christian teaching that Jesus never sinned, well then if we are to believe that God's Servant is Jesus, then why is Jeremiah 46:27-28 speaking of him being punished?

Answer for yourself: Did you notice that even the New Testament refers to the nation of Israel as the Servant?

READING YOUR THEOLOGY INTO THE VERSES, OR LETTING THE VERSES DETERMINE YOUR THEOLOGY? THE LATTER OR COURSE!

In any conversation there is always at least two parties. One is the speaker and the other the hearer. If we fail to understand who is actually speaking in Isaiah 52 then we will fail to interpret Isaiah 53 correctly. This is where most get it wrong from the get-go! Instead of Israel speaking it is the Gentile kings who are speaking and who are astonished at the errors of their perspective toward the Jewish people when corrected in the Messianic Age...the Gentiles admit their anti-Semitism and theologies have been wrong!

Isaiah 52:15 - 53:1 "So shall he (the servant) startle many nations, the kings will stand speechless; For that which had not been told them they shall see and that which they had not heard shall they ponder. 'Who would believe what we have heard?'" History is full of examples where the Gentile Church thought they were doing God a favor by persecuting the Jewish people. Boy, will they be surprised!

Quite clearly, right here in the beginning of this discourse the speaker is identified. It is none other than the Gentile nations and their rulers and kings which will be amazed at what happens to the "servant of the L-rd" (the Jewish people), and they will say "who would believe what we have heard?" It is right here that most position themselves to incorrectly interpret Isaiah 53 but mis-identifying the speaker in these texts. The future meanings of these verses depend entirely upon who is speaking, and if this is not correctly discerned, then the misinterpretation of the Isaiah 53 passage is ensured. It makes a big difference whether the Gentiles are speaking about the Jewish people or the Jewish people speaking in these texts. But in order to correctly interpret Isaiah 53 we have to go backward into Isaiah 52 to determine who is speaking, for the same speaker will be speaking in Isaiah 53 as well.

Besides Isaiah 52:15 telling us explicitly that it is the nations of the world, the gentiles, who are doing the talking in Isaiah 53, but Micah 7:12-17 is a parallel passage and likewise speaks of the gentile nations' astonishment when the Jewish people again blossom in the Messianic age.

Micah 7:12-17

- **12 In that day also he shall come even to thee from Assyria, and from the fortified cities, and from the fortress even to the river, and from sea to sea, and from mountain to mountain.**
- **13 Notwithstanding the land shall be desolate because of them that dwell therein, for the fruit of their doings.**
- **14 Feed thy people with thy rod, the flock of thine heritage, which dwell solitarily in the wood, in the midst of Carmel: let them feed in Bashan and Gilead, as in the days of old.**
- **15 According to the days of thy coming out of the land of Egypt will I shew unto him marvellous things.**
- **16 The nations shall see and be confounded at all their might: they shall lay their hand upon their mouth, their ears shall be deaf.**
- **17 They shall lick the dust like a serpent, they shall move out of their holes like worms of the earth: they**

shall be afraid of the LORD our God, and shall fear because of thee. (KJV)

Now back to Isaiah as we exegete the verses:

53:1 "And to whom has the arm of the L-rd been revealed?"

In Isaiah, and throughout our Scriptures, G-D's "arm" refers to the physical redemption of the Jewish people from the oppression of other gentile nations (Isa. 52:8-12; Isa. 63:12; Deut. 4:34; Deut. 7:19; Ps. 44:3).

Let us look at examples to see if the arm of the lord refers to salvation from Gentile persecutors:

Isa 52:8-12

- **8 Thy watchmen shall lift up the voice; with the voice together shall they sing: for they shall see eye to eye, when the LORD shall bring again Zion.**
- **9 Break forth into joy, sing together, ye waste places of Jerusalem: for the LORD hath comforted his people, he hath redeemed Jerusalem.**
- **10 The LORD hath made bare his holy arm in the eyes of all the nations; and all the ends of the earth shall see the salvation of our God.**
- **11 Depart ye, depart ye, go ye out from thence, touch no unclean thing; go ye out of the midst of her; be ye clean, that bear the vessels of the LORD.**
- **12 For ye shall not go out with haste, nor go by flight: for the LORD will go before you; and the God of Israel will be your rereward. (KJV)**

Isa 63:12

12 That led them by the right hand of Moses with his glorious arm, dividing the water before them, to make himself an everlasting name? (KJV)

Deut 4:34

34 Or hath God assayed to go and take him a nation from the midst of another nation, by temptations, by signs, and by wonders, and by war, and by a mighty hand, and by a stretched out arm, and by great terrors, according to all that the LORD your God did for you in Egypt before your eyes? (KJV)

Deut 7:19

19 The great temptations which thine eyes saw, and the signs, and the wonders, and the mighty hand, and the stretched out arm, whereby the LORD thy God brought thee out: so shall the LORD thy God do unto all the people of whom thou art afraid. (KJV)

As you can see for yourself, in each of the above quotes the reference concerns Israel being delivered either from Egypt who persecuted them unto death, or the return from captivity in Gentile lands. Definitely, and without a doubt, the references to the "arm of the Lord" have to do with the nation of Israel being delivered and saved from the grasp of Gentile nations [and not one person].

WAS YESHUA DESPISED AND REJECTED OF MEN?

53:3 "Despised and rejected of men."

While this is clearly applicable to the Jewish people and the nation of Israel (Isa. 60:15; Ps. 44:13-14), it cannot be reconciled with the New Testament account of Jesus, a man who was supposedly

"praised by all" (Lk. 4:14-15)

Isa 60:15

15 Whereas thou hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations. (KJV)

Ps 44:13-14

- **13 Thou makest us a reproach to our neighbors, a scorn and a derision to them that are round about us.**
- **14 Thou makest us a byword among the heathen, a shaking of the head among the people. (KJV)**

Matt 4:25

25 And there followed him great multitudes of people from Galilee, and from Decapolis, and from Jerusalem, and from Judaea, and from beyond Jordan. (KJV)

who would later acclaim him as a prophet upon his triumphal entry into Jerusalem (Matt. 21:9-11).

Matt 21:9-11

- **9 And the multitudes that went before, and that followed, cried, saying, Hosanna to the Son of David: Blessed is he that cometh in the name of the Lord; Hosanna in the highest.**
- **10 And when he was come into Jerusalem, all the city was moved, saying, Who is this?**
- **11 And the multitude said, This is Jesus the prophet of Nazareth of Galilee. (KJV)**
- **Even as he was taken to be crucified, a multitude bemoaned his fate (Lk. 23:27).**

Luke 23:27

27 And there followed him a great company of people, and of women, which also bewailed and lamented him. (KJV)

Jesus had to be taken by stealth, as the rulers feared "a riot of the people" (Mk. 14:1-2).

Mark 14:1-2

- **1 After two days was the feast of the passover, and of unleavened bread: and the chief priests and the scribes sought how they might take him by craft, and put him to death.**
- **2 But they said, Not on the feast day, lest there be an uproar of the people. (KJV)**

Such was his popularity.

ISRAEL'S ADVERSARIES ARE FREQUENTLY LIKENED TO SICKNESSES

53:3 "A man [speaking in context of the nation of Israel] of pains and acquainted with disease."

Let us examine passages like Isa. 1:5-6; Jer. 10:19; Jer 30:12.

Isa 1:5-6

- 5 Why should ye be stricken any more? ye will revolt more and more: the whole head [nation] is sick, and the whole heart faint.
- 6 From the sole of the foot even unto the head there is no soundness in it; but wounds, and bruises, and putrefying sores: they have not been closed, neither bound up, neither mollified with ointment. (KJV)

Jer 10:19

19 Woe is me for my hurt! my wound is grievous: but I said, Truly this is a grief, and I must bear it. (KJV)

Jer 30:12

12 For thus saith the LORD, Thy [the nation] bruise is incurable, and thy wound is grievous. (KJV)

ISRAEL AS BEARING THE BRUNT OF THE GENTILE NATION'S HATRED AND MALICE TOWARD THEM

53:4 "Surely our (remember the Gentile rulers of the nations are speaking) diseases he (the nation of Israel was described in the singular remember?) carried and our pains he (the nation of Israel) bore."

In Matt. 8:17, this passage from Isaiah 53:4 is recorded as being "fulfilled" in Yeshua's healing of the sick, yet this Matthew passage is totally foreign to the original author's intention.

Answer for yourself: Was it really fulfilled by Jesus?

This is another blatant misquotation of a Jewish Scripture taken out of context and twisted to bring a different meaning in the New Testament which was totally foreign to the original writer. Where as Isaiah was referring to the nation of Israel being the recipient of Gentile anti-Semitism for centuries whereby the nation of Israel carried the insults and physical pain of Gentile persecution ("surely he hath borne our griefs, and carried our sorrows"- bearing the Gentile diseases, afflictions, suffering), we are led to believe in this supposed "fulfillment" in the New Testament that the meaning of Isaiah was that Jesus was to "carry the diseases of the people who physically healed." Nothing could be farther from the mind of Isaiah. Instead of Isaiah's original meaning of Israel being brutalized by the Gentile nations and powers of the world, the quote from Isaiah I stripped from its original context, the meaning twisted, and now in the New Testament it is supposed to mean Israel is blessing others through physical healing. This is absurd. But if you don't look up the quote yourself, read the context from where the quote is taken for yourself, you like I are relegated to reading the New Testament and accepting at face value everything it says without questioning anything. Such is foolish as we are showing you. This is absolutely no "fulfillment" of anything in Matthew 8:17. Saying so does not make it happen. Biblical ignorance is our enemy! You must face the fact that Matthew 8:17 is totally inconsistent with the text from Isaiah.

Not only did the writer take the quote out of context his uses of it in the New Testament, but to apply this verse of Isaiah to Jesus is impossible as we have already shown that the servant is the nation and not an individual!

ISRAEL'S PLIGHT IS MISUNDERSTOOD AND MISJUDGED IN THE EYES OF THE GENTILE NATIONS

- 53:4 "Yet we ourselves (remember the gentile nations are speaking) esteemed him stricken, smitten of G-D and afflicted."

- Jer. 30:17 - of G-D's servant Israel (30:10), it is said by the nations, "It is Zion; no one cares for her."

ISRAEL WOUNDED BY THE SINS OF THE GENTILE NATIONS...NOT FOR THEM AS SOME TYPE OF GENTILE ATONEMENT

53:5 "But he was wounded from (NOTE: not for) our transgressions, he was crushed from (AGAIN: not for) our iniquities."

Whereas the Gentile nations had thought the Servant (Israel) was undergoing Divine retribution for its sins at their hands (53:4) [they were helping God out by punishing the Jews], the Gentile nations now realize that the Servant's (Israel's) sufferings stemmed from their own (Gentiles) actions and sinfulness. This theme is further developed throughout the Jewish Scriptures such as Jer. 50:7; Jer. 10:25.

Jer 50:7

7 All that found them have devoured them: and their adversaries said, We offend not, because they have sinned against the LORD, the habitation of justice, even the LORD, the hope of their fathers. (KJV)

Jer 10:25

25 Pour out thy fury upon the heathen that know thee not, and upon the families that call not on thy name: for they have eaten up Jacob, and devoured him, and consumed him, and have made his habitation desolate. (KJV)

Also we must notice that the Messiah "shall not fail nor be crushed till he has set the right in the earth" (Isa. 42:4).

ISRAEL'S VOICE IS NOT HEARD...NO ONE TO TAKE UP FOR HER

53:7 "He was oppressed and he was afflicted, yet he did not open his mouth. Like a lamb that is led to slaughter, and like a sheep that is silent before its shearers, so he did not open his mouth."

It is important to note that in the prior chapter (Isa. 52), Israel is said to have been oppressed and taken away without cause (52:4-5). A similar theme is developed in Psalm 44, wherein King David speaks of Israel's faithfulness even in the face of gentile oppression (44:17- 18) and describes Israel as "sheep to be slaughtered" in the midst of the unfaithful gentile nations (44:22,11).

Regarding the claim that Jesus "did not open his mouth" when faced with oppression and affliction we have a different testimony from Jn. 18:23, 36-37.

John 18:23

23 Jesus answered him, If I have spoken evil, bear witness of the evil: but if well, why smitest thou me? (KJV)

John 18:36-37

- 36 Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence.
- 37 Pilate therefore said unto him, Art thou a king then? Jesus answered, Thou sayest that I am a king. To

this end was I born, and for this cause came I into the world, that I should bear witness unto the truth. Every one that is of the truth heareth my voice. (KJV)

These are not the only references, but this proves the point. I think you will have a hard time proving that Jesus "opened not his mouth" to his accusers and that he was "silent before his shearers."

Again in the hands of the New Testament writers reference is made to this being fulfilled in the ministry of Jesus, but let me remind you that originally the quote was used in a corporate or national sense and not an individual sense.

WAS YESHUA EVER RECOGNIZED AS A RULER?

53:8 "From dominion and judgement he was taken away."

We must take note of the correct translation of the Hebrew in this passage. Without a doubt Israel is the apple of God's eye. It is to them God called to be a Kingdom of Priests, a holy nation, to lead all other nations to God. Israel has always had preeminence. From this exalted status and position they were repeatedly taken into captivity and subjugated to Gentile cruelty and debasement. Instead of being the ruler and example (the scepter shall not depart from Judah), the nation of Israel became ruled and dominated by those to whom they were sent.

Most Christians writers are forced to mistranslate this verse, since - by Yeshua's own testimony - he never had any rights to rulership or judgement, at least not on the "first coming."

John 18:36

36 Jesus answered, My kingdom is not of this world: if my kingdom were of this world, then would my servants fight, that I should not be delivered to the Jews: but now is my kingdom not from hence. (KJV)

The King James version of the Bible states in Isaiah 53:8 that "he was taken from prison." There is no record of Yeshua ever "doing time" in prison to the best of our knowledge.

"FIGURATIVE" OR A "LITERAL" DEATH?

- **53:8 "He was cut off out of the land of the living."**
- **53:9 "His grave was assigned with wicked men."**

Ez. 37:11-14 describes Israel being "cut off" and G-D promises to open its "graves" and bring Israel back into its own land. Other examples of figurative deaths include Ex. 10:17; 2 Sam. 9:8; 2 Sam. 16:9.

CONFIRMATION OF PLURALITY AND NOT SINGULARITY

53:8 "From my peoples' sins (remember the Gentile nations are speaking), there was injury to them (the Jewish people)."

Here the Prophet makes absolutely clear, to anyone familiar with Biblical Hebrew, that the oppressed Servant is a collective Servant, not a single individual. The Hebrew word "lamoh", when used in our Scriptures, always means "to them" never "to him" and may be found, for example, in Psalm 99:7 - "They kept his testimonies, and the statute that He gave to them."

"ONE" DEATH OR "MANY" DEATHS?

53:9 "And with the rich in his deaths."

Perhaps King James should have changed the original Hebrew, which again makes clear that we are dealing with a collective Servant, i.e., Israel, which will "come to life" when the exile ends (Ez. 37:14).

Ezek 37:14

14 And shall put my spirit in you, and ye shall live, and I shall place you in your own land: then shall ye know that I the LORD have spoken it, and performed it, saith the LORD. (KJV)

NON-VIOLENCE AT THE HANDS OF THEIR PERSECUTORS?

53:9 "He had done no violence."

One need only look at Matt. 21:12; Mk. 11:15-16; Lk. 19:45; Lk. 19:27; Matt. 10:34 and Lk. 12:51; then judge for themselves whether this passage is truly consistent with the New Testament account of Yeshua.

Matt 21:12

12 And Yeshua went into the temple of God, and cast out all them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves, (KJV)

Mark 11:15-16

15 And they come to Jerusalem: and Yeshua went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold and bought in the temple, and overthrew the tables of the moneychangers, and the seats of them that sold doves;

16 And would not suffer that any man should carry any vessel through the temple. (KJV)

Luke 19:45

45 And he went into the temple, and began to cast out them that sold therein, and them that bought; (KJV)

Luke 19:27

27 But those mine enemies, which would not that I should reign over them, bring hither, and slay them before me. (KJV)

Matt 10:34

34 Think not that I am come to send peace on earth: I came not to send peace, but a sword. (KJV)

Luke 12:51

51 Suppose ye that I am come to give peace on earth? I tell you, Nay; but rather division: (KJV)

This certainly does not lend well to pacifism.

WHERE ARE YESHUA'S PHYSICAL CHILDREN?

53:10 "He shall see his seed."

The Hebrew word for "seed", used in this verse, always refers to physical descendants in the Jewish Scriptures. (Gen. 12:7; Gen. 15:13; Gen. 46:6; Ex. 28:43). A different word, generally translated as "sons", is used to refer to spiritual descendants (Deut. 14:1, e.g.). The New Testament paints a picture of Yeshua as unmarried. This is rather surprising since Christianity teaches that Yeshua never sinned, forgetting that the first positive commandment is to procreate. For Yeshua not to be married and have children literally would be a violation of the Law, and I John 3:4 tells us that transgression of the Law is sin.

DID YESHUA LIVE A LONG LIFE?

53:10 "He will prolong his days."

Answer for yourself: Not only did Yeshua die young and childless, but how could the days be prolonged of someone who is alleged to be G-D?

CAUSE OTHERS TO BE JUST OR JUSTIFY THE UN-GODLY?

53:11 "With his knowledge the righteous one, my Servant, will cause many to be just."

Please notice again the correct translation: *the Servant will cause many to be just, he will not "justify the many."*

The Jewish mission is to serve as a "light to the nations" which will ultimately lead the world to a knowledge of the one true G-D, this both by example (Deut. 4:5-8; Zech. 8:23) and by instructing the nations in G-D's Law (Isa. 2:3-4; Micah 4:2-3).

Deut 4:5-8

- 5 Behold, I have taught you statutes and judgments, even as the LORD my God commanded me, that ye should do so in the land whither ye go to possess it.
- 6 Keep therefore and do them; for this is your wisdom and your understanding in the sight of the nations, which shall hear all these statutes, and say, Surely this great nation is a wise and understanding people.
- 7 For what nation is there so great, who hath God so nigh unto them, as the LORD our God is in all things that we call upon him for?
- 8 And what nation is there so great, that hath statutes and judgments so righteous as all this law, which I set before you this day? (KJV)

Zech 8:23

23 Thus saith the LORD of hosts; In those days it shall come to pass, that ten men shall take hold out of all languages of the nations, even shall take hold of the skirt of him that is a Jew, saying, We will go with you: for we have heard that God is with you. (KJV)

Isa 2:3-4

- 3 And many people shall go and say, Come ye, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for out of Zion shall go forth the law, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.

- 4 And he shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people: and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. (KJV)

Micah 4:2-3

- 2 And many nations shall come, and say, Come, and let us go up to the mountain of the LORD, and to the house of the God of Jacob; and he will teach us of his ways, and we will walk in his paths: for the law shall go forth of Zion, and the word of the LORD from Jerusalem.
- 3 And he shall judge among many people, and rebuke strong nations afar off; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruninghooks: nation shall not lift up a sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more. (KJV)

As you can see, we Gentiles are not “just” by something Israel does in our place; rather, we are just because we learn from them the principles, ordinances, and laws of God contained in God’s Torah, which when obeyed and kept, makes one righteous before God. God’s ways are enumerated in His Law: 248 positive commandments, and 365 negative commandments. Each individual Law is a part of a Covenant foundation; whether it be the laws pertaining to the Covenant of God with the Jews or the non-Jews of the world. Each of these laws are Covenant stipulations whereby when obeyed we maintain right-standing before God.

HOW CAN G-D GIVE HIMSELF ANYTHING...HE HAS IT ALL!

53:12 "Therefore, I will divide a portion to him with the great, and he shall divide the spoil with the mighty."

Answer for yourself: If Yeshua is G-D according to traditional Christian teaching, does the idea of reward have any meaning?

Answer for yourself: Is it not rather the Jewish people - who righteously bore the sins of the world and yet remained faithful to G-D (Ps. 44) - who will be rewarded, and this in is described more fully in Isaiah chapters 52 and 54?

For your next study I suggest you concentrate on the articles on true Biblical Atonement on our other website:

<http://www.faithofyeshua.faithweb.com>

THE ONLY CONCLUSION WE CAN RIGHTFULLY DRAW FROM TRUTHFUL EXAMINATION OF THE TEXTS IS THAT THE IDENTITY OF THE “SERVANT” IN THE PROPHET’S FOURTH SERVANT SONG, ISAIAH 53, MUST BE THE NATION OF ISRAEL AND NOT ONE INDIVIDUAL...NOT YESHUA BY HIMSELF...AND YESHUA IS NOT THE FULFILLMENT OF ISAIAH 53



20%^{off}
COUPON CODE: **NF20**

on all **Hosting Plans.**
APPLICABLE ON NEW SIGN-UPS AND UPGRADES



DID THE JEWS ALWAYS INTERPRET ISAIAH'S SUFFERING SERVANT OF CHAPS. 52 & 53 AS THE NATION...OR DID RASHI CHANGE THE INTERPRETATION AS THE CHRISTIANS SAY?

Jews for Jesus publish in their literature that Rashi, a Jewish Rabbi around 1000 A.D., is responsible for the altering of the interpretation of Isaiah 53 for all of Israel whereby they, after his influence, no longer interpreted Isaiah 53 as an "individual" but as a "nation."

Answer for yourself: Is such a statement made by Jews for Jesus accurate?

The following is from Contra Celsum 1:55 ...from around **248 C.E./A.D. [long before Rashi]** by the early **Church Father Origen:**

“Now I remember that, on one occasion, at a disputation held with certain Jews, who were reckoned wise men, I quoted these prophecies (Isaiah 52:13-53:8); **to which my Jewish opponent replied, that these predictions [referring to Isaisa 52 and 53] bore reference to the whole people, regarded as one individual, and as being in a state of dispersion and suffering, in order that many proselytes might be gained, on account of the dispersion of the Jews among numerous heathen nations.** And in this way he explained the words, "Thy form shall be of no reputation among men;" and then, "They to whom no message was sent respecting him shall see;" and the expression, "A man under suffering." Many arguments were employed on that occasion during the discussion to prove that these predictions regarding one particular person were not rightly applied by them to the whole nation. And I asked to what character the expression would be appropriate, "This man bears our sins, and suffers pain on our behalf;" and this, "But He was wounded for our sins, and bruised for our iniquities;" and to whom the expression properly belonged, "By His stripes were we healed." For it is manifest that it is they who had been sinners, and had been healed by the Saviour's sufferings (whether belonging to the Jewish nation or converts from the Gentiles), who use such language in the writings of the prophet who foresaw these events, and who, under the influence of the Holy Spirit, applied these words to a person. But we seemed to press them hardest with the expression, "Because of the iniquities of My people was He led away unto death." For if the people, according to them, are the subject of the prophecy, how is the man said to be led away to death because of the iniquities of the people of God, unless he be a different person from that people of God? And who is this person save Jesus Christ, by whose stripes they who believe on Him are healed, when "He had spoiled the principalities and powers (that were over us), and had made a show of them openly on His cross?" At another time we may explain the several parts of the prophecy, leaving none of them unexamined. But these matters have been treated at greater length, necessarily as I think, on account of the language of the Jew, as quoted in the work of Celsus.”

Now if you read this close you see two opinions concerning the interpretation of the text: the Jewish and the Gentile Church Fathers. But without a doubt, the Jews, at this early date, believed that the Isaiah 52 and Isaiah 53 passages dealt with corporate Israel and not an individual.

This is all the more important because the Christians [Jews for Jesus] teach that the Jews interpreted Isa. 53 as referring to the Messiah (individual) until the medieval commentator Rashi who began to explain it as referring to the people of Israel, thus changing the prior interpretation that the passages

did the jews always interpret isaiah's suffering servant of chapters 52-53 as the nation...or did rashi change the interpretation as christianity says?

referred to only an individual. Nothing could be further from the truth. The evidence speak for itself. So when Christians claim that it was only with the commentary of Rashi (1040-1105) that the Jews began to refer to Isaiah 52:13-53:12 as referring to the entire nation of Israel then they are in error and their message is false.

This misconception began with Edward Pusey, who wrote in his 1876 introduction to The Suffering Servant Of Isaiah According To Jewish Interpretations (trans. Driver and Neubauer, New York: Hermon Press, 1969) that "The new interpretation began with Rashi" (p. XLIV).

As you have seen the interpretation of corporate Israel for Isa. 52 and 53 is neither new, nor did it begin with Rashi. Over 800 years before Rashi the Church Father Origen records for us that the Jews contemporary with him interpreted this passage as referring to the entire nation of Israel.

This material can be found on the Internet or by obtaining Contra Celsum, trans. Henry Chadwick, Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, Book 1:55, 1965, p. 50).

So the bottom line is this: Jewish Biblical exegesis subscribing to the belief that the people of Israel was the suffering servant spoken of throughout the entire passage pre-dates Rashi by many centuries and Jews for Jesus, or anyone who says different is simply wrong. Shalom.